

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XLIV, No. 17
WHOLE No. 1114

January 31, 1931

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGES
CHRONICLE	393-396
EDITORIALS	
The Man in the Case—Removing the Freshman—Lee Returns to West Point—The Encyclical on Marriage—Alfred Watterson McCann—The Wickersham Report	397-399
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Whitewashing Henry VIII—A Catholic Laymen's Conference—Dr. Millikan and the Creator—War Dangers in Europe: II. Political Consequences	400-407
EDUCATION	
Education for Marriage	408-409
SOCIOLOGY	
A Misunderstood Institution	409-410
POETRY	
Epitaph for an Actor	407
WITH SCRIP AND STAFF	411-412
DRAMATICS	
Current Plays and Players	412-413
REVIEWS	413-416
COMMUNICATIONS	416

Chronicle

Home News.—On January 19, Mr. George W. Wickersham placed the first part of his report as chairman of the Law Enforcement Commission in the President's hands, and on the following day, the President transmitted it to Congress with a covering letter. The report was confined to the Commission's investigation of the enforcement of Prohibition, and revealed considerable diversity of opinion among the members. Briefs written by the several members showed that two favor the repeal of the Amendment, four further trial, with a more vigorous effort at enforcement, while five admitted the advisability of a revision of the Eighteenth Amendment. One member, Mr. Monte Lemann, did not sign the report. A summary asserted that the Commission, as a whole, opposed repeal of the Amendment, the restoration in any form of the saloon, the engagement of the Federal or State Governments in the liquor trade, and modification of the Amendment to authorize the manufacture of light wines or beer. Holding that there had never been proper enforcement or observance of the Volstead Act, and that the present organization for enforcement was inadequate, the Commission agreed that the cooperation of the States was necessary, which cooperation could not be had in the

absence of a favorable public opinion in the States. The report was signed subject to reservation of the right of every member to express his opinion in supplementary reports.

The one point on which a plurality of the Commission agreed, that is, possible revision of the Amendment, to read "The Congress shall have power to regulate or to prohibit," was definitely rejected by the President in his letter to Congress. But he emphatically concurred with the other recommendations noted above. In his view, the report was calculated to "stimulate the clarification of the public mind and the advancement of public thought." A review of the editorial opinion expressed throughout the country indicated that the report was not considered to be of striking value. On January 21, Senator Tydings, of Maryland, proposed, in a resolution, to call Mr. Wickersham to ascertain what "outside" influences shaped the report, and on the same day Mr. Wickersham issued a statement to the press, denying that any persuasion had been used by the President bearing upon any recommendations in the report. On the same day, bills for the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment were introduced by Representatives Lehlbach, of New Jersey, and La Guardia, of New York.

Over protest by the President and by the officials of the Red Cross, the Senate on January 21, as an amendment to the Interior Department bill, authorized an appropriation of \$25,000,000 for the Red Cross. This money was to be used for food, medicines, and other supplies not only in the drought districts, but wherever it might be required. Opposition was expected in the House.

On January 17, the Fish committee appointed by the House of Representatives to study Communism and its workings in the United States, made its report. It declared that more than 500,000 Communists, organized under leaders in twenty divisions of the country, were working for the overthrow of the American political and economic systems. The headquarters of the group, the report declared, were in New York, and this bureau was in constant communication with Moscow. Fourteen recommendations were made, chief among them being legislation by Congress to outlaw the Communists in this country by canceling the citizenship of its members, and forbidding naturalization in future, and by deporting all alien Communists. The report also suggested that the State Department investigate the production of lumber and pulpwood by convict and forced labor, and its ex-

portation by the Soviet to the United States, and that Congress consider the advisability of placing an embargo on the importation of manganese from the Soviet Union. A separate report, filed by Representative Nelson, of Maine, contended that Communism could be best met by establishing social and economic justice for American workers. Representative Bachmann, of West Virginia, immediately filed a bill to deport alien Communists and to exclude members of the party from naturalization. It was said that other bills to give force to the Committee's recommendation would follow.

Austria.—According to our special correspondent in Austria, the new bill for the regulation of unemployment doles was delayed and the House voted a provisory measure for the continuation of the payments as long as the funds continued. The

Varia film from Remarque's famous war book was severely attacked by the Nationalists and Fascists, in imitation of their German brethren. At first the Austrian Government declined to ban the film, but finally it was forced to yield to the pressing demands and prohibited the film. The Greek Premier, M. Venizelos, visited Vienna with his wife. The purpose of the visit was the ratification of the treaty of arbitration and friendship between Austria and Greece. Austria has been imitating some of the neighboring countries in her efforts at lowering prices. But she has met with no more success than the other experimenters. In his inauguration speech, the new Chancellor, Dr. Otto Ender, among other important tasks of the new Government mentioned the organization of a cheaper and simpler administration. This was merely one phase of the greater problem facing the Government in the economic crisis. Production, the Chancellor said, had to be improved, commerce and traffic furthered, and unemployment dangers warded off by correcting the causes of this condition. The Chancellor outlined a program of work for the new Government and immediately set an example by depriving the Parliament of the luxury of Christmas holidays. In view of Austria's aims and ambitions it was not surprising that in the conference held at Vienna this month between representatives of the Austrian and Hungarian Governments a decided effort was made to circumvent most-favored-nation pacts. It was disclosed at this meeting that the whole principle of the most-favored-nation clause, from which the United States and France chiefly benefit, was generally resented in central Europe.

China.—During the week Nanking launched an extensive campaign against the Reds, though the latter continued to report gains in their followers. Meanwhile, in the Japanese Diet, Chinese Government officials were given full credit for efficiently working towards the solution of political and social problems, especially by making it a point to identify themselves in unequivocal terms with constructive work of administration affording effective protection to persons, property and legitimate economic pursuits of the native and foreign population within her

borders. At the same time, in Rome, Archbishop Costantin, Apostolic Delegate to China, in an interview warned the world of the danger of over-emphasizing China's disturbances. "We missionaries," he said, "both from motives of Christian charity and from a duty of sheer honesty must correct the unconscious defamation of China produced by continually bringing to light only the mournful and criminal aspects of the Chinese revolution."

Czechoslovakia.—An embarrassing situation was created by the expiration, on December 16, 1930, of the commercial treaty of 1927 between Czechoslovakia and Hungary. The treaty was of importance to the former country, because of its industrial exports, to the latter because of its agricultural shipments. The cause, however, of Czechoslovak agriculture was seriously affected by the liberal terms granted to Hungary in the treaty; but attempts made at Budapest in June, 1930, to negotiate a new treaty did not succeed.

France.—An act freeing two Communist Deputies, MM. Marty and Duclos, sentenced three years ago for subversive propaganda in the French military forces, was passed by the Chamber on January 15, by a vote of 270 to 258. Premier Steeg professed himself disinterested, declaring it a matter for the Chamber to decide without Government leadership. Former Premiers Tardieu and Poincaré had both opposed similar resolutions, offered intermittently by the Communist members of the Chamber. It remained to be seen whether the Premier's neutrality in this question would gain the support of the Communists, who in recent years have, on contested issues, always voted against whatever Government was in power.

Polities On January 22 the Steeg Government was defeated in the Chamber after a heated fight on a measure of farm relief. The conflict had started within the Cabinet more than a week before, when Léon Meyer, Subsecretary of Commerce, opposed the price-pegging project of Victor Boret, Minister of Agriculture, designed to protect the native wheat-growers. Threats of resignation from the Cabinet were exchanged, and an attempt to pacify the antagonists by referring the matter to a commission proved unavailing. In the meantime Opposition Deputies were waiting with interpellations on the leakage of the news, and made a vigorous attack on the Government, charging it with responsibility for premature disclosure of the price-fixing project, and for the consequent increase in wheat prices on the open market, which benefited not the farmer but the speculator. It was on the issue of confidence based on these charges that the Steeg Cabinet was defeated, by a vote of 293 to 283, an unusually heavy roll call in the Chamber. The Premier and his Cabinet presented their resignations to President Doumergue the same evening, after a tenure of office of less than six weeks, during half of which the Chamber was not in session. The roll call by party affiliation was not available at this writing.

Treaty with Hungary

Steeg Cabinet Falls

Constructive Government Work

Great Britain.—By the largest vote ever registered against it, 282 to 249, the Labor Government was defeated on January 21 on an amendment to the Education bill proposed in the interest of Catholic and other non-provided schools. Since no question of principle was involved but merely a specified guarantee in fact, the Government, despite the demands of the Opposition, refused to resign, and in a subsequent vote carrying the Education bill to a third reading, secured a safe majority. The defeat of the Government was due to the fact that twenty-six Laborites and eight Liberals voted with the Conservatives against Mr. MacDonald. The Education bill is considered the outstanding measure of social legislation in the present session; it extends the school age from fourteen to fifteen years and includes maintenance grants for needy families affected by the extension. About 500,000 children would be retained at school for an additional year, and this would require a large number of new schools and of enlargements. The Conservatives opposed the bill, in general, because of the maintenance grants and the alleged extravagance at the present time of depression. Catholics and religious bodies who controlled "non-provided" (in distinction to the Government "provided") schools attacked the bill because it failed to make any allowance for the building and maintenance of schools required by the extension of the school age; full allowances, however, were made for the "provided" schools. When the Education bill came up for the second reading, in November last, the Hierarchy and Catholic members of Parliament pointed out that 30,000 children in Catholic schools would have to be kept at an added expense of more than £1,000,000. (Catholics maintain 1164 elementary schools with 426,000 children in attendance.) The Government was asked to contribute fifty per cent of the increased costs; according to a statement by John Scurr, Labor member, "The Bishops (Catholic) are of opinion that any grant given to provided schools to enable them to meet the requirements of the Board of Education should in equity be given also to the non-provided schools." Grave doubts were expressed after the defeat of the Government on the amendment that it would be possible to push the bill as it now stands through the third reading.

After nine weeks of serious application, the Indian Round Table Conference concluded its session on January 19 with complete satisfaction. Prime Minister MacDonald, in his closing address, outlined the proposals for the new India that would emerge from the Conference. Details of this projected new nation have already been noted in this column. The framework for an autonomous government was drawn up by Lord Sankey's committee and was accepted at a plenary session of the Conference. India would be a federation of the British and native Indian States. The powers of the Crown would be vested in a Governor General through whom matters pertaining to finance, defense and foreign relations would be transacted. The legislative powers would reside in an Upper and Lower House, with a responsible Cabinet controlled

by membership in Parliament. Full freedom would be enjoyed by the Central and Provincial legislatures. Though the Crown would retain control in the matter of finances, the legislatures would have power in the raising of revenue and its expenditure in certain non-reserved details. The electoral laws would be designed to protect the rights of the minorities, especially the Moslems. Other reservations included British control during the transitional period, and the agreement to continue further discussion of the Constitution by British and Indian representatives. The plea for a general amnesty of political prisoners, made by the Maharajah of Bikaner, was welcomed by Mr. MacDonald with a promise that "he would not be backward" in effecting it. A "White Paper" on the Indian settlement was announced in Parliament as soon to be issued. Both Labor and the Liberals were satisfied with the results of the Conference. The Conservatives have attacked it under varying formalities.

Japan.—Much interest centered in the release of the annual survey of foreign affairs read before the Diet by Baron Shidehara, Foreign Minister. In reviewing the year, Baron Shidehara touched upon the London naval treaty, whose significance he stated could not be overestimated; Japan's relations with the Nanking Government, towards which he expressed heartiest good will; and Soviet relations, described as amicable. "Our friendly relations," he said, "with the nations in Europe and America are entirely satisfactory. . . . On the question of the United States' immigration law, which for the past seven years has been weighing heavily on popular sentiment in this country, there is no longer any doubt that our position is now fully understood and appreciated by the large majority of the American people. We shall watch further developments of the question with unimpassioned but keen interest." The Foreign Minister's survey was in general remarkable for its note of confidence.

Jugoslavia.—Dispatches from Belgrade to the Vienna *Reichspost* stated on January 14 that M. Maximo-vitch, Jugoslavian Minister of Education, had resigned that post after a conflict with his colleagues arising from his desire to curtail the reading of the Catholic version of the Scriptures in the schools.—Four bomb outrages, thought to be the work of Croatian nationalist extremists, took place during the week of January 4 to 10, during which occurred the second anniversary, on January 6, of the Yugoslav dictatorship. Loyalist Zagreb papers ascribed the outrages to Dr. Pavelitch, a former Deputy, now resident in Italy.

Nicaragua.—On January 21, Foreign Minister Dr. Julian Irias announced that he had that day consummated a treaty with Honduras designed to settle an old border dispute between the two countries. By virtue of the agreement it was stipulated that the problems shall be settled in accordance with an award made by the King of Spain

Government
Defeat on
Education

Foreign
Relations

End of
Indian
Conference

Resignation of
Minister

Relations
with
Honduras

in 1906. A commission will be appointed consisting of a representative of each country and an engineer appointed by the United States Department. The American will have power to decide all controversies without appeal and will interpret all doubtful matters in the award. The treaty, he admitted, was awaiting approval of the Presidents and Congresses of Nicaragua and Honduras, but no hitch was anticipated.

Panama.—On January 16 Provisional President Arias handed over the Government to the new Constitutional President, Ricardo J. Alfaro, former Minister to the United States. In his inaugural address President Alfaro, discussing the conditions which had brought about the

**Alfaro
Inaugurated**

change in the regime, said: "The masses had begun to doubt everything and believed the suffrage a farce, the law a subterfuge, public opinion a falsity, virtue a handicap, reputation a useless thing, wisdom a superfluous adornment, prestige a merchantable article, and ability an object of artificial manufacture." He said, further, that there would be no persecution, but a careful investigation of the acts of the past Administration and that any legal action warranted would be taken. The day before the Presidential inauguration the United States evidenced that it would recognize and continue normal relations with the new Government. The Ministers of Columbia, China and Mexico also notified the Panama Foreign Office of the continuance of diplomatic relations. Following his inauguration President Alfaro in a decree continued the Cabinet appointed by the Provisional President, merely changing Sr. Arias Parades from the Foreign Affairs portfolio to Government and Justice, and Dr. J. J. Vallarino from Sub-Secretary of Government and Justice to Foreign Affairs.

Russia.—Orders for complete mobilization of all railroad workers on a wartime basis were issued on January 18 by Labor Commissar Tsikhon and countersigned by Railroad Commissar Rukhimovitch.

**Labor
Mobilization**

This involved the complete "mobilization," in the full military sense of the word, of all persons competent to undertake railroad service. Criminal proceedings would be taken against defaulters.—The Ninth Congress of the Communist Youth party (Komsomols) opened in scenes of wild enthusiasm in Moscow on January 17. Also on January 17, a protest against the execution last September of forty-eight Russian intellectuals was issued in Paris over the signatures of many of France's leading writers, scholars and scientists, representing many different schools of French thought.

League of Nations.—A joint manifesto, pledging European nations to keep the peace, was submitted to the Commission, sitting at Geneva, for the study of the plan for the European Union by Aristide Briand, on behalf of the four great Powers, France, Great Britain, Germany, and Italy. The pledge had originally been drafted

and proposed in private by Arthur Henderson, British Foreign Minister. The reading of the pledge in the Council room on January 21 was followed immediately by its acceptance with applause. The Commission, in which twenty-three of the twenty-seven nations concerned were represented by their Foreign Ministers, had been warned by Hendrik Colijn, former Premier of Holland, of the gravity of the economic aspects of the situation. The text was as follows:

As a result of our discussions and conversations during the last few days concerning the problems which our Governments have respectively to face, it has become plain that economic recovery is now being hindered by a lack of confidence due to widespread political anxiety. That anxiety has been increased by irresponsible talk in various quarters concerning the possibility of an international war.

We recognize that there are political difficulties in Europe at the present time and that these difficulties have been accentuated by the economic instability and unrest which the world economic depression has caused. The best service we can render toward the improvement of the economic position is the firm assurance of European peace.

We therefore declare, as Foreign Ministers or responsible representatives of European States, that we are more resolutely determined than ever to use the machinery of the League of Nations to prevent any resort to violence.

Three principal committees were decided upon by the Commission: composed in each instance of the four Great Powers and seven or eight of the lesser States. The

committees were: (1) a wheat committee, to study all measures capable of assuring the export of future harvest

surpluses of Eastern Europe, including the preferential tariff scheme; (2) an agricultural credits committee; (3) a committee on the general organization of the European Union. The Commission decided to invite Russia, Turkey, and Iceland to join its deliberations for economic questions only.—At the League Council session, Germany's case against Poland with regard to the elections in Silesia in November, 1930, was presented by Dr. Curtius, German Foreign Minister. After accusing the Poles of terrorism, Dr. Curtius asked only that the Polish Government properly punish the offenders.

G. C. Heseltine will consider the motives and ideals of the devisers of a modern plague in his article, "The Origin of Birth-Control Ideas," to be published in AMERICA next week.

The third and concluding paper of Gerhard Hirschfeld's series on "War Dangers in Europe" will deal with "The International Aspect."

Religion does cause some newspapers to devote space to it, right or wrong. William I. Lonergan finds much to comment on in "All of a Monday Morning."

What Paul L. Blakely thinks of the Wickersham Report will be set forth by him in an article next week.

"Some Novelists in Tradition," by Francis X. Connolly, discusses three women who react against literary anarchy: Willa Cather, Henry Handel Richardson and Sigrid Undset.

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 31, 1931

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRED PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief
PAUL L. BLAKELY FRANCIS X. TALBOT WILLIAM I. LONERGAN
JOHN LAFARGE CHARLES I. DOYLE JAMES A. GREELEY
Associate Editors
FRANCIS P. LEBUFFE, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTION POSTPAID
United States, 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 Europe, \$5.00

Addresses:

Publication Office, 461 Eighth Avenue, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Medallion 3-3082

Editors' Office, 329 West 108th Street, New York, N. Y.

CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

The Man in the Case

LAST year, a commissioner appointed by the Governor of New York reported to the legislature the custom of some banks in receiving savings deposits under another designation but without the safeguards generally employed to protect them. The legislature replied that the custom was sound enough, since banking is always safe when "conducted by men of character, integrity and ability." But its inference that all banks in the State were conducted by honest and intelligent men, was dissipated only a few months ago when, through the failure of a bank against whose practices the commissioner had protested, hundreds of depositors lost the savings of a life time.

No doubt the principle asserted by the legislature was wholly correct. We must have faith in the integrity of those with whom we deal, if we are to carry on any business at all. But prudence suggests limits to that faith. In every human activity, there is a man in the case, whether that activity be banking, brewing, or carrying on the government. And when there is question of government, prudence does not suggest, but demands, that faith be kept in the background, and unfailing vigilance be put on guard.

Wise in many fields of knowledge and experience, Jefferson was never wiser than when he preached that doctrine to our political forebears. He had no patience with trust in government. What he deemed imperatively necessary was an unfailing jealousy that would bind all governments in chains, to wit, by the plainly expressed limitations of a written constitution. Governments, he knew, always seek to expand the field of their powers, and a power once assumed or conceded, is relinquished with difficulty, if at all. Even under a Constitution, that vigilance, he thought, should not be relaxed. And for an excellent reason.

For a Constitution is but a scroll on parchment. Its administration and its interpretation are in the men who at the time make laws, and sit in judgment upon them, or act as administrators. In every instance, there is a man

in the case, open to ambition, personal aggrandizement, sinister suggestion; in brief, a man not lifted above the influence of human passion and human greed by the trappings and brief authority of office. If Jefferson proposed a rotation in office that would seem to make effectiveness impossible, and desired a Revolution every twenty years, to sweep away the accretions of misgovernment, his advice merely reflects, through a somewhat distorting medium, a most sound principle in the government of men.

How far we have departed from that wisdom is all too evident from the present tremendous assumption of powers and authority by the Federal Government. Could Washington, Mason, Wilson, Madison, Jefferson, have dreamed it possible, other and more stringent limitations would certainly have been made part of the Constitution. Washington, seeking new and improved methods of brewing on his plantation, could hardly have conceived it possible that within a century and a half his innocent solicitude for good beer would have brought him into a Federal penitentiary. What Jefferson would have said of a Federal agent bringing a Federal maternity dole to Richmond, or invading the Western country with a milk bottle in one hand and the plan for a new kind of cradle in the other, cannot be told, for the sight would have left him speechless.

Day by day we grow in the folly of entrusting some new activity to a Federal bureaucrat. Deep rooted is our insane delusion, wholly contradicting the facts in the case, that whatever the Federal Government does, is done well. Congress wholly disregards the letter and spirit of the Constitution in authorizing appropriations; whatever promises a good result somewhere, at some time, to someone, is in this twentieth century held to be within the right of Congress to subsidize.

Perhaps Jefferson was wrong. We have the chains of a Constitution. But in what respect do they bind Congress?

Removing the Freshman

A CHANGE of considerable importance was announced last week at Yale. Under the new system, credits and similar devices will be gradually dispensed with, and students will be rated by their actual attainments. The plan includes a change long advocated by this Review. Hereafter all applicants presenting the necessary credentials will be put on probation for one year. During this time they will be carefully studied, and in the event that all tests are satisfactorily undergone, will be permitted to matriculate at the opening of the second year.

Just why the adoption of this sifting process has been so long deferred, is a puzzle to the layman. He knows, as all educators know, that many a young man who can pass all the entrance examinations is less fit for an academic career than is the harmless necessary cat. At college, he does more than cumber the ground; long generations of him is chiefly responsible for the general low state of learning in American colleges. Since he cannot adapt himself to the academic world, that world adapts itself to him. Should he eschew the humanities, he can

apply his talents to machine work, or tap dancing, or the Italian poets—in English. Since his French will certainly evaporate in a year's time, write him down for the proper credit in the dean's record, and count it against the number which he needs for the bachelor's degree. By all means smooth the way, and send him out with a diploma in his hand, even if he has little in his head.

It is not clear from the announcement that Yale intends to demand a comprehensive examination at the end of the fourth year. Probably the authorities believe that the reports to be made regularly throughout the student's course, render it unnecessary. During the first and second year, the courses will be largely prescribed, and a strict account demanded; in the last two years, a larger degree of liberty will be accorded. The changes thus far announced should very effectively remove from Yale any young gentleman who either cannot or will not apply himself to his books and his studies.

Lee Returns to West Point

IN its editorial comment on the acceptance of a portrait of Robert E. Lee, to be hung at West Point, the *New York Times* praises the tolerance or good taste of the Government, for admitting "this portrait of the greatest rebel in its history." The spirit of the *Times* is admirable. But in ranking Lee as this country's greatest rebel, its historical acumen is open to doubt. Another rebel also looms large in our history, and his name is George Washington.

Which of the two was the greater rebel, may be left to our debating societies, if any can be found interested in American history. The question is somewhat academic, but it may be admitted that as a rebel, the elder Virginian was more successful. At least, he did not go back to a prostrate country, and a home in ruins. By way of amendment, it may be added that Lee had no home to go back to. It had been confiscated by the Washington Government.

But there is a peculiar fitness in the return of Lee to West Point. When Lee was assigned in 1852 as that institution's superintendent, both discipline and the course of studies called for vigorous revision. In his brief tenure of office, Lee set standards, and by enforcing them gave the institution a rank it has never lost. Professor Leacock observes that while General Lee and General Jackson are familiar terms, we do not often think of Professor Lee and Professor Jackson. But each was an educator, and Lee in particular, an educator of unusual ability. Even if his work at West Point be omitted, what he did after the war at Washington College, secures his reputation.

As we have observed on more than one occasion (even at the risk of reopening the conflict ended at Appomattox!) we are not so rich in great men, that we can afford to minimize Lee. His insistence that education is not education, unless it makes the pupil a better Christian, is so fully in harmony with Catholic ideals, that it should be his passport to Catholic veneration. Some may think him mistaken in his constitutional views, but none can

deny the sacrifices he made to fight for the independence of the South, or fail to find edification in his wholehearted submission in defeat to the Will of God. Lee has gone back to West Point, and if his spirit controlled our educational system, God would return to our classrooms.

The Encyclical on Marriage

AS was remarked last week, no papal document ever achieved so quickly the widespread distribution of the Encyclical on Christian Marriage. That fact is evidence that the world has been waiting for such authoritative statements as can come only from the common Father of the Faithful. It has tired of what Dr. Johnson used to designate "wiggle waggle," and is seeking a source that is not a Delphic oracle. In the Encyclical it finds a strong grasp upon principles, a broad vision of life, and a sureness of treatment, it has elsewhere sought in vain.

The distribution of the Encyclical is amazing. The National Catholic Welfare Conference has issued it in pamphlet form, and the neat and convenient edition prepared by the *Catholic Mind* has already reached a circulation of more than 150,000. It was republished in special editions in New York by the *Catholic News* and the *Brooklyn Tablet*, and similar editions have either been printed, or will soon be published by a number of Catholic journals throughout the country. As it was also carried by the *New York Times* and *World*, it is quite probable that within ten days of its release, at least a million and a half copies of the Encyclical were in circulation.

That its teachings will influence the whole country for good, we do not doubt. But we look for a special effect upon Catholics, namely, a better understanding of the teaching office of the Bishop of Rome.

The loyalty of Catholics in the United States to the Pontiff has never been called in question; they recognize him as Vicar of Christ, and accept his mandates without question. But there is reason to fear that, on part of some, this loyalty is based upon a sentiment good enough in itself, but not strong enough to bear the vigor of assaults launched against Christ's Vicar. These Catholics speak with respect of "the Holy Father," and that is good, for so he is; but they do not realize that one part of a father's right and duty is to teach, as well as to command. Still less do these good people understand the extent of the authority of the Bishop of Rome as visible head of the Church. While they have never given the subject serious thought, the Church is to them a group of pious people, held together by the maintenance of a common emotion.

The truth that the Church is a perfect society, with power to legislate, to judge, to execute, and to bind in the forum of conscience, they would admit as an abstract proposition. But their assent is notional, as Newman has pointed out, and not real. In case of serious conflict, that assent might be qualified or conditioned, to the point of heresy or apostasy. The existence of Catholics of this

type once more raises the question of how thoroughly we are teaching religion in our schools and colleges, as well as a host of other questions. Happily, however, these Catholics are not numerous, and most of them can be amended by a little instruction. That instruction will be found in the recent Encyclical in a most attractive and effective form.

When we come to the end of the story, after brushing aside misinformation and, as far as may be possible, prejudice, it will be found, we think, that all good men and women agree with the Pope. For in the face of an unbelieving and scoffing world, he asserts, with an authority that is unique, the principles of Jesus Christ, and in His Name, demands respect for womanhood, for the home, and for the sanctity of chaste marriage. That respect the world needs most sadly today.

Alfred Watterson McCann

ON January 19, Alfred Watterson McCann died suddenly in the city of New York. Once more AMERICA mourns the death of an old and true friend.

By profession Alfred McCann was a food chemist, and as such he had a national reputation. But that was not the real Alfred McCann. The man was a knight on the field, with lance ever couched against iniquity, because he was, first, last and always, a Catholic.

Joyce Kilmer once said that every line written by a Catholic should show in some way that the author was a Catholic. Alfred McCann's was the same philosophy. His creed gave a sureness to all he wrote, and his firm grasp of Catholic philosophy made him a fearless and undaunted champion of the truth.

Years ago, he contributed a daily column to the old New York *Globe*. He had a passion for pure food, properly prepared, and sold at an honest price. But he also had a passion for purity in faith and morals, and one passion showed quite as clearly in his writings as the other. An article denouncing manufacturers who sold unwholesome candies to school children, was quite likely to include a denunciation of unclean creatures who sold them unwholesome papers and magazines. He might begin most interestingly with an explanation of the food value of fish, and end even more interestingly with the argument from design for the existence of God. He pleaded with a whole nation for legislation to protect our food supply, and no less convincingly for legislation to protect our people against public assaults on religion and morality. For his was the old Catholic doctrine that while we must take care of our bodies, our first care must be for the soul.

We want more men like Alfred McCann, men in eminent position who can truly say—although their own lips would never say it—"I am not ashamed of the Gospel." Of his home life, it does not become us to speak, yet we cannot refrain from mentioning an instance to show the spirit of that Catholic family. Mrs. McCann requested that friends would contribute the money they would otherwise spend on flowers, to funds for the relief of the unemployed.

Farewell for a little time, Alfred Watterson McCann, true friend, lover of the poor, champion of little children, crusader in every righteous cause. You confessed Christ before men, and He will confess you as you stand before the Father. May the prayers which we breathe for his everlasting rest, be also an encouragement to us to fight the good fight, as he fought it, fearlessly, unflinching, to the end.

The Wickersham Report

THE worst charge thus far made against the Wickersham report is that the eminent Bishop Cannon approves it.

It would be unfair, however, to the distinguished members of the commission to assert that its sole claim to consideration is Bishop Cannon's *imprimatur*. Too many, the Bishop included, have confounded the "summary," which appears to be the work of Chairman Wickersham, with the findings of the several commissioners. The simple fact is that not a single member wholly approves Prohibition as it is.

After more than ten years of trial, two of the commissioners recommend immediate repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment, and five suggest a revision of the Amendment. Thus the vote is seven to four against this noble experiment.

As for Mr. Wickersham, it is enough to say that after his statement of a year ago, nothing better than the "summary" could be looked for. At that time Mr. Wickersham announced that the commission's work was simply to discover ways and means of enforcing the Volstead Act. He assumed that the Amendment was in perfect accord with the spirit and letter of the Constitution. Whether or not the Act could be enforced, was a matter of no consequence. That purpose and assumption unfortunately discredited the commission in the eyes of intelligent men.

For the whole spirit and purpose of the Constitution are at variance with the Eighteenth Amendment. The Volstead Act has no claim whatever to be classed as a rule of reason, enacted by competent authority for the common good. Even considered as sumptuary legislation, it goes far beyond the limits of the Amendment; for while the Amendment bans alcoholic beverages, the Act imposes limitations on alcoholic liquors not used, and not intended to be used, as beverages. With equal legality the Act might as well have destroyed—as it has attempted to destroy—every constitutional guarantee of man's rights as a citizen and an individual.

That the report will shed much light on how to rid ourselves of the incubus of Prohibition is not probable. Its most valuable feature is the straightforward recommendation of Messrs. Baker and Lemann that the Amendment be repealed as the first step back to reform and decency.

Meanwhile, the "summary" may be left to bask in the sunshine of the smile of Bishop Cannon. That eminent prelate probably never noticed that the vote against the noble experiment was seven to four.

Whitewashing Henry VIII

HILAIRE BELLOC

(Copyright, 1931)

MANY weapons are used against the Catholic Church in the modern world, some more common in one country, others in another. Among the most powerful has been the Historical Myth. An historical falsehood is started (sometimes in good faith, more often not) which either directly or indirectly weakens the Catholic position.

By an historical falsehood which weakens the Catholic position *directly*, I mean one which openly mentions the Church or one of its doctrines, or clearly opposes a well-known position: for instance, saying that St. Peter was never in Rome. I mean by a falsehood attacking Catholicism *indirectly*, one which does not deny a Catholic doctrine or position, but substitutes for a truth favoring the Faith or weakening its enemies, an untruth working the other way. For instance, the myth of a great and glorious Queen Elizabeth ruling an adoring nation.

The indirect attack often appears quite innocent and seems to deal with things which are immaterial to Catholicism one way or the other. It is only on considering their ultimate effects that one discovers their real character. Such a falsehood often rapidly becomes adopted officially—that is, by the universities and the secondary and elementary schools and the examination system; it becomes taken for granted in newspaper, book and speech; before we know where we are, it passes as unquestioned history.

The most remarkable and deplorable thing about the anti-Catholic myths thus started is that the greater part of the indirect ones are accepted by the mass of Catholics in common with their fellow-citizens. The direct falsehoods—those which attack the Catholic Church by name or obvious implication—arouse our suspicion and are met fairly well, though not always with the vigor that might be desired; but the indirect ones nearly always pass muster and do worse work perhaps in the Catholic body even than they do among its opponents.

I have just assisted at the birth of an indirect myth of this kind. It has only had a few years in which to work, and it is already beginning to take root. Catholics themselves are beginning to repeat it as a matter of history, and if we do not look out, in the next ten years or so it will become as official as any of the others. I have already attacked it in my book on Wolsey. I propose to expose it here briefly, and I hope that, if the exposure is vigorously kept up, we may prevent its becoming established; though we know how difficult it is to prevent anti-Catholic history from becoming established once it starts.

This new myth may be stated as follows:

Henry VIII did not break with Rome on account of his sordid affair with Anne Boleyn. He had always intended to divorce his wife years before Anne Boleyn was heard of, and the Anne Boleyn episode is but a secondary incident in a policy which would have been undertaken anyhow.

In Henry's own time people took it for granted that Anne Boleyn was the whole cause of the trouble. Henry's

own outrageous conduct was convincing enough, the domination which Anne acquired over him was clearly obvious to everybody at the time—the Emperor, the Pope, Henry's own wife Catherine, the whole world, had no more doubt upon the matter than we doubt the connection of the Jameson Raid with the South African War. It was a thing on which there could be no question.

The truth standing thus, it was clear that the break with Rome into which the unfortunate King was somewhat reluctantly forced had a very unpleasant origin, and that origin lends its distasteful color to all the first part of the Reformation story in England. It would be a great feather in the cap of those who desire to glorify the English Reformation if they could give it a nobler origin, or at any rate one less disgusting; hence the recent creation of the myth to which I allude.

Now what first suggested that myth?

The policy of the divorce between Henry VIII and his legitimate wife Catherine of Aragon, the daughter of Ferdinand and Isabella, sovereigns of Spain, was openly started (as everybody knows) in 1527. There is evidence that it may have been secretly begun the year before, and I have myself shown the probability that Henry and Anne had come to some private arrangement as early as the summer of 1525. But 1525 is the very earliest date on which the divorce can have been considered, 1526 the first date upon which there is any evidence of its having been privately mentioned by diplomatic agents, and 1527 the first date in which it became a matter of public policy.

We are not absolutely certain of the date of Anne Boleyn's birth. It was probably as early as the year 1500, it may have been 1502, it has even been put as late as 1507—a very improbably late date. Even if Anne were born in 1507 she would in 1525 have been a young woman of eighteen, and we know that she had already had two important affairs, one with Wyatt and the other with Percy—before that date; for she was not exactly bashful.

Many years before, in 1514, the Spanish King Ferdinand, the father of Henry's Queen, Catherine, had made a separate peace during a war in which Henry was involved with him as an ally. This had annoyed young Henry (he was only twenty-three) extremely, and he had gone about openly expressing his anger against his father-in-law for playing him such a trick.

In that year (1514) Anne Boleyn, whenever she was born, was only a child. If, as is more probable, she was born in 1500, she would still be a child in 1514, and there could be no question of her having captured Henry VIII at that date.

If we accept the latest and least probable date for Anne's birth, 1507, the thing is still clearer. She would in that case have been only seven years old in 1514.

Therefore, if the myth can be started that Henry began his policy of divorcing his wife as early as 1514, Anne

Boleyn ceases to be the primary cause of that policy.

Having thus got ourselves clear on the motive which first suggested the new myth, let us next see how that myth was launched.

There was at that time, in 1514, a Venetian banker called Lippomano at Rome, and on August 28 of that year he put into a letter a piece of gossip which he had heard to the effect that the King of England, in his anger against the King of Spain, proposed to repudiate his wife, the King of Spain's daughter, *because he could not have children by her* and that *he intended to marry the daughter of a French duke, Bourbon*. The thing is only put forward as a bit of chance gossip for which the writer, hundreds of miles away from England, in no way vouches.

So far from Catherine not being able to have children she had already borne children who had died, and she was young enough to have many more. She did in fact have many more, one of whom, as we know, Princess Mary, survived to be Queen. Lippomano even gets wrong the name of a recent Pope whom he mentions in the same letter. Put all this together, the fact that it is but a piece of isolated gossip, that the man who gives it does not vouch for it, that he is writing far away from England, is all wrong in other facts in his brief allusion, and it is clear that this brief passage has no weight as evidence.

On this little fragment of vague and obviously unfounded gossip, demonstrably full of errors, it has been proposed to establish the myth that Henry founded his policy of divorce eleven or thirteen years before the Anne Boleyn incident! Out of a huge mass of state papers—thousands in number—referring to this period in the four volumes generally referred to as "Letters and Papers," and in the Venetian and Spanish Calendars, this one document (which has been extracted from the Venetian Calendar) has been put forward by Professor Pollard to introduce the new theory.

Now it is manifestly absurd to go against the whole stream of history, and to maintain an impossible contradiction of what all contemporaries took for granted, upon such very flimsy evidence as this, *if it stands alone*. In all the thousands and thousands of documents, English and foreign, relating to the period, not another word has been found upon the matter. The Emperor had not heard of it, nor the Pope, nor Henry's Court, nor any of his statesmen, nor any of the scores of public people whose letters have been preserved. The Venetian Ambassadors are our best source of information in this period. Venice had envoys at Henry's court. They report secretly and in detail all they hear. It was imperative for Venice to know how Henry stood with Spain. Yet Venice has not asked a word on this supposed plan of Henry's. The thing would have been of such vast importance that all Europe would soon have been buzzing with it. Not a breath on it appears anywhere in Europe.

Now all this was familiar to those who wanted to start the myth. One piece of gossip repeated by a man hundreds of miles away, could not stand against such odds.

Therefore it was necessary to back up the absurdity with an appearance of further evidence, and I want my readers to pay particular attention to the way in which

the things was done, because it is one more example showing how historical false coins are put into currency.

In order to back up the absurdly insufficient gossip sentences of Lippomano, Professor Pollard gives no less than five further references. Not only (he tells us) is there this document to which he alludes, but five others backing it up independently; and he gives reference at the foot of the page to their numbers in the Venetian Calendar—numbers 482, 483, 487, 492 and 500.

Reading such a formidable array of extra evidence, Professor Pollard's readers will have said to themselves: "Here is a whole mass of documents proving the policy of divorce to have been established in 1514." Not one reader in a thousand looks up references of this sort; they are only put in for show. Had the assertion been less extraordinary than it was I would not myself have been at the pains of verifying all these five formidable footnotes, but as the whole thing looked to me extremely odd I took the trouble to go into these references in detail.

My astonishment may be imagined when I discovered that in not one of these documents was there the least reference to the divorce!

To those who do not know how anti-Catholic history is written, this may seem incredible, but I assure my readers that it is strictly true. Every one of these five documents is innocent of the subject. The first is from the Venetian Ambassador in London, by far the best authority. It talks of course of the strain between the two Governments, which was the most open fact of the time, but there is nothing on the supposed divorce. The next is from the Commander-in-Chief of the Venetian forces returned from France. It talks about the peace negotiations, and says nothing whatever about any supposed divorce. The next is a letter written by Henry himself to the Pope, or rather a Latin letter written by the King's secretary. It expresses anxiety about the peace negotiations, but has not one syllable about divorce. The next is a dispatch from the Venetian Government to their Ambassador in France upon Anglo-French policy against Spain. It contains no suggestions or hint of the divorce from beginning to end. The fifth and last document is from a Venetian in London writing to his two brothers, also about the strain between the two Governments, and equally innocent of any knowledge of, or reference to, a policy of divorce.

There was no policy of divorce until Anne Boleyn had captured Henry. Mary Tudor was the admitted heiress to the throne. There were years between the moment after which Catherine could no longer bear children and Henry's first move to get rid of her for his new flame.

The policy of the divorce fell upon Europe with sudden violence, it occupied all minds, it disturbed all international relations, it was the one great subject of the day. It originated, as all sane history has always allowed, all tradition and all contemporary opinion, in the affair between Henry Tudor and the Duke of Norfolk's niece. To cast doubt on so evident a truth will need evidence more solid than a distant phrase or two of gossip and quite irrelevant footnotes which turn out, on being followed up, to have nothing to say on the subject.

A Catholic Laymen's Conference

WILLIAM I. LONERGAN, S.J.

THINKING men imbued with Catholic principles and of apostolic spirit, nearly 150 of them—such was the lay personnel of the Fourth National Conference of the Laymen's Retreat Movement and the first national Catholic gathering of 1931, met early in January, as the guests of the Rt. Rev. Hugh C. Boyle, Bishop of Pittsburgh, and the Rt. Rev. Alfred Koch, O.S.B., Archabbot of St. Vincent's Abbey, and the Catholic laymen of the Pittsburgh diocese, at the spacious Benedictine abbey at Latrobe, Pa.

In January, 1928, under the auspices of his Eminence Cardinal Dougherty, of Philadelphia, and of the "Men of Malvern," the first Conference was held with an attendance, barring the clergy and local delegates, of but twenty laymen from eleven dioceses in the country. In summary, the recent Conference represented some forty dioceses in twenty-four States, with four members of the Hierarchy in attendance, at least half a dozen Monsignori, and seventy-four other priests, secular and regular. The latter were from nineteen different Orders. The marked increase in attendance of secular priests over previous Conferences, was one of the most hopeful signs of growing interest in the movement among a group particularly qualified to promote it.

The largest delegation hailed from the relatively insignificant Diocese of Richmond, Va. Thirteen laymen under the leadership of their zealous retreat master, the Rev. Edwin J. Lee, made up the party. A group of nine laymen came from Erie, led by the Rev. Raymond Geiger, Diocesan Director of Retreats. The delegates traveling furthest registered from El Retiro San Inigo, the Jesuit retreat house in the Archdiocese of San Francisco. Among the distinguished guests were two young Franciscans, the Rev. Sylvester O'Brien and the Rev. Bernard Nolan, who by a happy coincidence were passing through the States en route from Ireland to Melbourne, Australia, to initiate the first closed-retreat house for laymen there under the auspices of Archbishop Mannix.

His Lordship Bishop Boyle both opened and closed the Conference with a kindly welcome and a whole-souled and inspiring farewell address. The Rt. Rev. Gerald P. O'Hara, Auxiliary Bishop of Philadelphia, and the Rt. Rev. Joseph Albers, Auxiliary Bishop of Cincinnati, participated in several of the sessions, while with more than usual graciousness the Rt. Rev. John Mark Gannon, Bishop of Erie, attended every meeting of the Conference. In an informal talk at the first session, Bishop Gannon's felicitous remarks brought comfort and consolation to more than one of the laymen present when he stated that he had come to the Conference "to see what sort of men the Holy Ghost had chosen to be pioneers in propagating the retreat movement in the United States." He emphasized for them that like the early Apostles they were objects of the special love and predilection of the Holy Spirit who had signaled them out to spread a movement freighted with tremendous graces and results which not even they but only God could foresee.

The annual National Retreat Conference is based on no formal organization aiming at a standardized policy or given over to legislation about retreats, but has in view only to afford opportunity for an exchange of experiences between retreat masters and laymen interested in perpetuating and perfecting the closed-retreat movement. If judged by achievements in line with this objective, the 1931 Conference was an unqualified success. The meeting was a fine manifestation of the excellent adaptability of the retreat spirit to various circumstances of time and place, for while all the delegates and retreat centers evidenced that they were earnestly cooperating in furthering the movement in accord with the wishes of the Sovereign Pontiff, there was also manifested, along with this unity of purpose, an admirable variety of ways and means employed to effect results.

It is characteristic of the retreat movement that it generates and sustains in the laity zeal, fervor, generosity and an apostolic spirit. Certainly, all these admirable qualities shone forth in the Latrobe meeting. The sessions were as lively as they were interesting and informative; the papers read and discussed rich in food for thought and thoroughly inspirational; the devotional phases of the sessions highly edifying. These last included Pontifical Mass in the beautiful Archabbey and, on the closing day of the Conference, Pontifical Vespers in the magnificent Pittsburgh Cathedral, where more than 3,000 men along with a large gathering of local and visiting clergy, listened to a stirring and timely sermon by Rt. Rev. Bishop Gannon. A banquet Sunday evening with some 700 men in attendance brought the meetings to a happy conclusion.

Most of the papers, unfortunately, perhaps, were in the hands of the clergy. However, Mr. John A. Farley, of Baltimore, Md., read a very instructive paper on the organization and promotion of retreats through parish units. Two of the most enthusiastic talks of the meeting were given by the Rev. Joseph Boyle, C.S.C., and the Rev. Joseph P. Turner, C.S.S.R., while the Rt. Rev. Archabbot, the Rev. Sigismund Cratz, O.M.Cap., and the Rev. Nilus McAllister, C.P., all read scholarly and helpful papers explaining respectively why the retreat movement must go on, the relation of retreats to Catholic Lay Action, and the promotion of retreats by cooperation with the parishes.

If the programmed talks were chiefly clerical, the discussions were thoroughly participated in by the laity present, who spoke freely, frankly, and earnestly, recounting experiences and offering suggestions that added to the fruitfulness of the Conference. It was indicated by the men that out of the retreats there have grown up throughout the country all sorts of Catholic activities most fruitful for the Church and social well-being. Great stress was laid on the potentialities in the movement for furthering Catholic Action, which, it was insisted, did not always mean public social action. An earnest but respectful plea was voiced by the men for more active cooperation on the part of the Hierarchy and the clergy, both secular and Religious, in the movement.

Reports showed a large increase during 1930 both in the number of men's retreats offered and in attendance.

Whereas a few years ago there were only a couple of retreat houses open all the year round, today there are twenty in eighteen dioceses, while during the summer forty-four centers in thirty-seven dioceses offer additional opportunities to men for closed retreats. So far as retreats for special groups are concerned, great interest centered particularly in the reports of the Rev. Joseph Turner, C.S.S.R., and his work with the Knights of Columbus, at San Alfonso, Long Branch, N. J., and of the Rev. Patrick Maloney, O.F.M., with the labor-union groups around Chicago, and of the Rev. Samuel H. Ray, S.J., in his retreats to boys given at Grand Coteau, La. The record at this last center during 1930 more than doubled the 1929 attendance; in twenty-nine retreats 534 boys representing fifteen public and eight Catholic schools were accommodated at St. John's College for three-day retreats.

Perhaps the following thoughts from various Conference speakers best reflect the tone and spirit of the meeting:

Bishop Boyle: All sorts of things have come to occupy man's attention, not only at his work but in his leisure hours. The theater, the cinematograph places, the radio, automobiles, the telephone, the victrola are all things that attract his attention and make him almost forget he has an immortal soul. . . . When people are young, vigorous, healthy and the blood runs strong in their veins religion is apt to seem of secondary importance, but when to that is added these other things that keep men from thinking about the end for which Almighty God has placed them here, then indeed religion is apt to be in a bad way. . . . It is curious, if we have faith in the supernatural at all, to see how unimportant in human lives the supernatural is and how important everything else is. . . . [Retreats] make you realize the great realities of life. . . . Once again those things will be brought to your attention and will occupy a prominent place in your mind which are the things most worthy of attention.

Bishop Gannon: If society is to be cured of the immorality which corrupts it, if governments are to be relieved of the confusion which confronts them, if men are to be re-fashioned after the image and likeness of God, it will not be accomplished through radios or television or electric refrigerators, but it will be through the holy Sacraments of Christ and the burning zeal and pious example of men like you.

Archabbot Alfred Koch, O.S.B.: The retreat movement is not only useful but necessary, not only necessary but imperative if the doctrine of Jesus Christ must serve as a bulwark against the onslaughts of our materialistic age. . . . To renew all things in Christ, to hasten the coming of Christ's kingdom over the entire earth must be the dream and ambition of every Catholic who considers himself worthy of his Master.

Rev. Sigismund Cratz, O.M.Cap.: The merits of the Church are judged by the conduct of the individual Catholic. There can, therefore, be no effective lay apostolate without a deepening of the layman's faith, without a strengthening of his will. . . . The man who would engage in the works of the apostolate needs the strength that comes of much prayer. He needs the help of the Holy Ghost that comes to a man in the solitude of retreat.

Rev. Joseph P. Turner, C.S.S.R.: If humanity is to be saved at all it must be taught to lift its eyes from the sordid, shallow trinkets of earth and to focus them upon the enduring treasures of heaven, and this I would say specifically is the God-given mission of our Catholic men and women. Through them the spiritual life must be brought back to the world and humanity renewed in spirit and strengthened in virtue. But to accomplish this mission they themselves must be imbued with the right spirit; they themselves must be strengthened in virtue; they themselves must be instructed in the doctrines of their holy religion. Only through these means are they equipped for the battle and prepared for that glorious lay apostolate through which our Holy Father hopes to obtain Catholic Action, and this is precisely the purpose of the retreat houses.

Before adjournment it was voted that the next Conference should be held in Boston whose Cardinal-Archbishop in a most cordial greeting which he sent to the 1931 meeting, very graciously offered to be its host. Before adjournment, too, new national officers were elected. Mr. Edward W. Joyce, of Boston, was chosen National Chairman; Mr. W. J. Conaty, of Richmond, Va., Vice-Chairman; and Mr. Robert A. Sullivan, of Boston, Corresponding Secretary. As the need was felt for a permanent national office through which retreat centers might be kept informed during the year of activities of other centers and a clearing house provided for the exchange and solution of problems connected with the movement, the office of Executive Secretary was created and entrusted to Mr. William A. Ryan, of Pittsburgh, who generously volunteered to assume the burden of the work.

Dr. Millikan and the "Creator"

FRANCIS P. LeBUFFE, S. J.

THESE seems to be abroad among us an unseemly eagerness to catch up any pronouncement by a scientist on the matter of God or of religion. Surely, if a scientist of rank believes in God and religion, it were wise to note it, especially in these days of loudly proclaimed antagonism; but every time a scientist uses the words *God, religion, soul*, it does not mean that he is on the side of truth. If I call a cow a cow, and you call a horse a cow, we agree in words. But—!

A recent instance was the address of the retiring president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science at Cleveland on December 29, 1930. Of Dr. Robert A. Millikan's rank among physicists there can be no question, and his style reminds us of that of the English scientists—Eddington, Jeans, Thompson—who clothe

deepest scientific thoughts in clear, pleasing language. With his usual lucidity, he unfolded the mysterious intricacies of the universe. But it was not this that brought unusual publicity. In just two or three places Dr. Millikan touched on the question of God and religion, and at once editorial pens—or typewriters—were busy. The one sentence that caught the headline hunters was (*Science*, January 2, 1931, p. 5):

This [formation of hydrogen in interstellar space] has been speculatively suggested many times before in order to allow the creator to be continually on his job. Here is perhaps a little bit of *experimental* finger-pointing in that direction.

So Dr. Millikan admits a creator! As far as words go, yes. But does he admit: (1) a God in the same sense that we do—a personal God, transcending and distinct

from, though at the same time immanent in the universe; (2) religion in the sense of a personal recognition of and submission to this personal God; (3) any validity in the claim of a Church such as ours—the Catholic Church, infallible mouthpiece of God, with a definite creedal expression of beliefs and dogmas?

The answer seems to be—emphatically no.

Dr. Millikan in his various articles and speeches is a trifle over-zealous in charging gross ignorance to mankind prior to Galileo and Newton. He misrepresents Scholasticism by such a statement as this (*New York Times*, December 21, 1930):

Facts are no longer deduced from, and obliged to conform with, an authoritative and rational synthesis as in scholasticism; no longer are they even given meaning thereby as they were in the mind of Kepler. Each fact acquired by observation and experiment is accepted as it stands, with its immediate and inevitable consequences, irrespective of the human desire to make the whole of nature at once amenable to reason.

A Procrustean bed, indeed! Can anyone who has really read Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, Suarez, Bellarmine recognize this as a valid description? Dr. Millikan's displeasure at the past seems to lead him into awkward statements (*Times*, 1. c.):

Medieval scholasticism was rational; modern science is in essence empirical. The former worshipped the human reason acting within the bounds of authority; the latter accepts brute facts whether reasonable or not.

Surely he does not mean this last. As a thinking man, if Dr. Millikan finds something that is patently unreasonable, he revamps his apparatus and checks back on his work. He does *not* accept it. Neither would the scholastics.

But about God. Does Dr. Millikan believe in a personal God, transcending and distinct from the universe, though immanent, present, therein? It is difficult to tell. In his book, "Science and the New Civilization" (Scribner's, 1930), he frequently places a disquieting disjunctive: "A nature or a God, whichever term you prefer" (p. 37); "God, or Nature, or the Universe, whatever term you prefer" (p. 177); "a God who rules through law, or a Nature capable of being depended upon, or a universe of consistency" (p. 178); "of the universe, or of God, whichever term you prefer" (p. 191). This sounds much like Pantheism; and other passages from "Science and the New Civilization" strengthen this judgment. (Hereafter references will be made to this book by citing the page only.)

If some one wishes me to change that last implied definition of Deity so as to make it read the unifying principle in the universe, I shall not object (p. 191).

Again, because of the growth of this evolutionary idea in human thinking, we have come to see that an institution like religion, insofar as it deals with conceptions of God, the integrating factor in this universe of atoms and of ether, and of mind, and of ideas, and of duties, and of intelligence, has not been and cannot be a fixed thing, that it has been continually changing with the growth of human knowledge, and that it will continue to expand as knowledge continues to grow (p. 185).

Again in his presidential address (*Science*, 1. c., p. 2) he says: "This [the fact of evolution] tended to call attention away from the *deus ex machina*, to identify the creator with his universe."

Dr. Millikan's creator is simply the universe, Phoenix-like, rejuvenating itself.

That God is not considered by Dr. Millikan as a personal God becomes clearer from his remarks about religion and what it means. Therein he has no least reference to religion as the acknowledgment, by acts of intellect and of will, of truths and duties which have God for their object. He says:

My conception, then, of the essentials of religion, at least of the Christian religion, and no other need here be considered, is that those essentials consist in just two things: first, in inspiring mankind with the Christlike, i.e., the altruistic ideal, and that means specifically, *concern for the common good*. . . . and second inspiring mankind to *do*, rather than merely to think about, its duty, the definition of duty for each individual being what he himself conceives to be for the common good. In three words, I conceive the essential task of religion to be "to develop the consciences, the ideals and the aspirations of mankind" (pp. 169-170).

The anthropomorphic God of the ancient world, the God of human passions, frailties, caprices, and whims is gone, and obviously with it the old duty, namely, merely or chiefly the duty to propitiate him, so that he may be induced to treat you, either in this world or in the next, or in both, better than he treats your neighbor . . . The new God is the God of law and order, the new duty to know that order and to get into harmony with it, to learn how to make the world a better place to live in, not merely how to save your individual soul. (P. 179; see also Millikan "Evolution in Science and Religion," p. 80.)

Evidently no personal God is there envisaged nor any duties which regard a personal God. Religion is sheer humanitarianism.

As for the possible bearing of Dr. Millikan's views on Catholicism we have it that it is the Golden Rule which Jesus made the sum and substance of his whole philosophy of life. When he said, "All things whatsoever ye would that men should do unto you even so do ye also unto them, *for this is the law and the prophets*," I take it that he meant by that last phrase that this precept epitomized in his mind all that had been commanded and foretold—that it embodied the summation of duty and aspiration (p. 168).

The amazing insight of Jesus is revealed by the fact that he kept himself so free from creedal statements . . . But his followers, unlike him, have . . . loaded their various branches of his religion with creedal statements which are full of their own woefully human frailties . . . What are, in contrast, these man-made creeds? Admittedly they have been written by men, groups of men called together for the purpose (p. 190).

And, cutting at the very root of all revealed religion, Millikan writes (*New York Times*, December 21, 1930):

In the old days men had made a wholly artificial and irrational distinction between the natural and the supernatural. Events which were sufficiently common and familiar were thought of as natural, and events which were uncommon and not understood were called supernatural. The idea of the uniformity or repeatability of events abolished completely all such child-like distinctions . . . Call all events natural, if you will, or supernatural, if you prefer, but forget—so says Galileo's method—either one term or the other.

Dr. Millikan has written learnedly of the "cosmic ray" which he describes so understandably as "the birthcries of the infant atoms of helium, oxygen and silicon" (p. 104) in interstellar space. Suppose now some beginner in physics were to attempt to describe Dr. Millikan's "cosmic rays"; he could not confuse things more than the learned doctor has done here. Why is it that even great scientists will not learn the accepted definitions of theological terms? A theologian should go to Dr. Milli-

kan to find out about "cosmic rays"; Dr. Millikan should go to the theologians to find out about "supernatural."

As for the soul, he has little that is definite, though there is one passage to which attention may be called. In itself it might be interpreted kindly, but when read in the light of much else he has written, it is not encouraging ("Evolution in Science and Religion," pp. 83-84):

Concerning what ultimately becomes of *the individual* in the process, science has added nothing and it has subtracted nothing. So far as science is concerned religion can treat that problem precisely as it has in the past, or it can treat it in some entirely new way if it wishes. For that problem is entirely outside the field of science now, though it need not necessarily always remain so. Science has undoubtedly been responsible for a certain change in religious thinking as to the relative values of individual and race salvation. For obviously by definitely introducing the most stimulating and inspiring motive for altruistic effort which has ever been introduced, namely, the motive arising from the conviction that we ourselves may be vital agents in the march of things, science has provided a reason for altruistic effort which is quite independent of the ultimate destination of the individual and is also much more alluring to some sorts of minds than that of singing hosannas forever around the throne. To that extent science is undoubtedly influencing and changing religion quite profoundly now. The emphasis upon making this world better is certainly the dominant and characteristic element in the religion of today.

Dr. Millikan and others like him are in revolt and inevitably so against creedal religions as they have known

them. As a reasonable man he wants a religious life "completely divorced from all unreason, all superstition, and all unwholesome emotionalism" (p. 194). That he has not found, but it is to be found in Catholicism where the creed is not *man-made*, but *God-Man-made*. It is in all things a "reasonable service" for the act of faith is essentially an act of the *intellect*, assenting to God revealing, after reason has discovered such an assent to be reasonable, and the will is *reason-led* when it accepts the consequent duties. Between that faith and science there never has been and never will be any conflict, any contradiction. At times there have been and will be apparent conflicts, but Dr. Millikan himself gives the saving solution when he speaks of the wave-theory of light and the corpuscular light-quant theory (p. 180):

Experiment has told us that both theories are right, and we have had the limitations of our knowledge jolted into us enough times lately in physics to believe it, in spite of our inability to see as yet just how the reconciliation is to be made.

So, too, in matters of Faith "the limitations of our knowledge," the essential poverty of "our thin minds that creep from thought to thought" (as Tennyson put it) have long since enriched us Catholics with a truly scientific poise of mind, *the ability to wait*, realizing intimately that "we see now through a glass in a dark manner, but then face to face."

War Dangers in Europe

GERHARD HIRSCHFELD

II. Political Consequences

AN economic need finds expression through politics. The present constellation of economic conditions in Europe, as I described them last week, is such that the different nations are desperately trying to solve the *economic* puzzle in a strictly *political* way. Unfortunately, the technique of the political game is so far behind the trend of economics that the phalanx of economics *versus* politics results in a terribly involved, and consequently dangerous, situation. The economic trend in any of the European countries, from Great Britain, France and Germany, down to so small a unit as Jugoslavia, is distinctly international. Yet the political consequences growing out of their economic (i. e., industrial, agricultural or financial) needs, are of a purely national color.

We have seen that Germany ascribes her serious economic depression mainly to two factors: (1) The annual Reparations debt to be paid to the former Allies, under the stipulation of the Young Plan, which makes itself felt by the German citizen in the form of enormous taxes, that, in turn, result in higher production costs, in decreased competitive ability on the world market and, finally, in decreased consumption capacity of the people by and large. (2) An insufficient outlet for the excess production of the powerful German industrial machine, since American, British, French and Italian competitors see

to it that the world market is not monopolized by German products.

The political expression of these two economic needs may be found accordingly, in the unanimous demand on the part of Germany, for a revision of the Treaty of Versailles, the cancellation of the Reparations debt, and the return of the colonies. Germans claim, therefore, that the first two clauses would free the country from a heavy financial burden and in the political field possibly return to the mother country some of the provinces that have been taken away from her, such as Polish Upper Silesia, the Polish Corridor, Tyrol, etc. The return of her colonies, again, would give German industry, in the popular German view, a more extensive territory for the sale of its surplus production.

Arrayed against the nations which have emerged victorious from the World War, Germany, naturally, is too weak to make herself heard and her demands duly respected. Consequently, she is looking around for alliances to strengthen the force of her argument.

Most Austrians agree that the country can, in her present condition, neither live nor die. Since it is populated by an almost purely Germanic race, creed and color, the majority of its population sees salvation in annexation by her great sister-nation. Italy, again, is demanding the revision of the peace treaties as an immediate objective. If Italy's demands are heeded, if the Treaty of Versailles

is scrapped and a new and better document agreed upon by all concerned, the gain of the Fascist State would not only result in equality with the European powers, would not only assure Italy of a predominant position in the Mediterranean, would not only give her more power and prestige all around, but would particularly endanger French influence in the Balkans, would automatically cause a decline of French political leadership, economic strength and financial preponderance and would give Italy a decided edge in the French-Italian controversy. Nevertheless, the fact remains that Germany may look upon Italy as a powerful ally in her propaganda for a more satisfactory (from the German viewpoint) order of things. Thus we arrive at the German-Austrian-Italian triangle of somewhat uniform interests in the heart of Continental Europe. There is more, however, to Italy's position than mere cooperation with the aforementioned nations. Such cooperation is simply a column in a carefully planned and well-designed political structure. Briefly, the economic problems of Italy consist of overpopulation and overproduction—to which may be added the factors of political ambition and national expansion. In preparation for the fulfilment of these needs and plans, Italy is looking toward Africa, where she demands the rectification of the Tripolitanian frontier; to Tunisia, where she insists on a settlement of the status of Italian citizens. Here she clashes with France which has firmly established her dominion in North Africa.

Similarly, in Asia, France holds a mandate over Syria. And in the Balkan Peninsula, France again it is who leads the Powers that compete for political influence and economic predominance. Mussolini has often emphasized his dream of a succession of the Roman Empire. Italy finds her way blocked on all sides by France and looks for this reason for ways and means to overcome this handicap. Thus relatively small matters such as the Tripolitanian and Tunisian demand take on a meaning beyond their original insignificance; and the claim for naval parity has been and is being insistently made which, according to general French view, has no precedent in history unless one wants to go back several thousand years. However, aside from this disturbing attitude, Italy has adopted some actually constructive steps with which to break through the wall of French imperialism.

Through her financial support, through a number of other activities such as building roads, improving ports, drilling Zogu's little army, etc., Italy has gained almost complete control of Albania, much to Yugoslavia's discomfort. She also holds important naval stations in the Aegean Sea. The ancient feud between Greece and Turkey has, with Italy presiding, been settled amicably. Besides, Italy is meeting the diplomatic skill of France in the Balkans with some of the opponent's own measures; financially (for instance, through a loan of £5,000,000 by the Banca Commerciale Italiana to Turkey); or diplomatically, in which connection we might recall the visit of Mr. Grandi to Warsaw as well as those of the Greek Premier, Venizelos, to Angora and several other capitals; the marriage of Princess Joanna to King Boris of Bulgaria; the negotiations between Rome and the Soviet For-

eign Commissar, Maxim Litvinoff, and numerous other instances.

Thus, Italy is making slow but steady progress; Hungary, governed by Admiral Horthy, is showing a natural sympathy for the Fascist State; Rumania, Poland and others, even if more or less deeply involved in French politics, are not deaf to the call. While gratefully accepting loans from Paris, they are too clever to miss a chance to make their friendship more desirable by playing just a bit into Italy's hands.

If we turn to the Balkan States proper, we find that a new development is taking place. Where they were formerly the political football of the European Powers, today they are coming into their own. Not that they possess any appreciable influence themselves; rather, they step onto the platform with grave economic problems of their own. And these problems will have to be watched carefully. We have seen that the nations on the Balkan Peninsula are predominantly agricultural, and that they have no outlet for a tremendous surplus production. Since the large Powers—France, Italy, and others—cannot help them in this dilemma, and cannot show them where to market their products at a reasonable price, the small nations have been trying to help themselves. They gathered at a conference at Athens recently, but since no official government representatives took part, the idea of cooperation remained a chimera. Once more, the Balkan States are trying to solve their *economic* problems via *national politics*. Too small to help themselves, they turn to the large Powers.

True, the French, the British, the Italian diplomats cannot bring relief to the farmers and peasants of the Balkans. They can, however, pour some more money into their Balkan investments; develop the oil industry in Rumania; expand the mining activities in Yugoslav copper and iron industries; extend the mileage of the railroads in the Balkans; and push ahead with the electrification of the Peninsula (the latter two are in bitter need of modernization). Great Britain and Italy cannot as generously distribute loans and investments as can France, which, next to Wall Street, has the largest gold reserve in the world. And France, no doubt, will go ahead and freely pour out her wealth over the Balkan States.

And the political consequences? Rumania, Yugoslavia and Poland, not to speak of the others, will naturally be tied to France more strongly than ever; particularly so, because the financial support thus granted will not ultimately do away with the agricultural depression of those nations, but can merely bring temporary relief. Thus, the Balkan States will not be able for a long time to develop any economic strength of their own, but will have to depend on France for further relief and extended credits.

This increased dependence is in line with the aim of French diplomacy which follows a program of consolidation of her War gains. It has been pointed out that France is satisfied with the *status quo*, that she has hardly anything to gain but much to lose. It is a fact that in the present European constellation she is without friends among the larger Powers, Great Britain, Germany and

Italy, which, under their present regimes show more signs of opposition than of sympathy. But she is the foremost power on the Continent, financially, economically, politically; she is the only country in Europe not seriously affected by the existing world-wide depression. And, as we have seen, she knows well how to use this power of hers to consolidate her position in the southeastern corner of Europe.

To the observer comes into mind—and quite involuntarily—the parallel between the pre-War diplomacy and the present attempt to duplicate it. If back in 1913 the Power in the East was Russia, today the place left vacant by the Russian giant is taken by a number of smaller States on the Balkan Peninsula. There is this difference, however, that today France is facing a much more powerful opposition than in the days before the War. That she knows it, may be seen from her military preparations and national defense budget which surpass even the 1913 extravaganza. It must be admitted that the factor of security plays an important part in the upkeep of a powerful force on land, in the air and on the sea; but then, it is hard to say where security ends and “readiness” starts.

Great Britain follows the same political program she has followed for centuries: a well-balanced European Continent. The fact that in former years such a program was backed by political considerations, while today the background is distinctly one of economic pressure, has little bearing on her actual stand. If, in the years before the War, the British policy in Europe was anti-German, today, under the Labor Government, it is anti-French and anti-Russian. Both then and now, either one single country was predominant on the Continent (for instance Germany in 1913 and France in 1930) or else it was endangering the European balance, as Russia is now doing.

Only on a well-balanced Continent, however, can British political and financial influence make itself felt to its full extent. As matters stand, France has replaced Great Britain as Europe's financier, as we have seen from the number of loans France has placed on the Balkans, to which must be added many a private loan in Germany, in Switzerland, the Netherlands, in Scandinavia, etc. Russia, again, has taken away much of the prestige which British rule carried in the Near East. So we find Great Britain adhering to a careful diplomatic policy, embodied in the following policies: (1) Cooperation, to a certain extent, with the anti-Versailles Powers—Germany, Italy, etc.; (2) Opposition to France on more than one issue. In this connection one remembers the British-French fight about the acceptance of the Young Plan, or the controversy about the French War debts to Great Britain, which the former wanted to pay only on the basis of the value of the franc at the time the loan was contracted. (3) A certain amount of propaganda against Russia which is supported by a powerful element in Great Britain. While this is the background of British political interest on the Continent, the stand of the Labor Government is not defined sufficiently to allow accurate opinion as to which course Great Britain's foreign policy will steer. All the misery of unemployment, of industrial curtailment and commercial depression, of heavy financial losses in

South America, etc., has not been strong enough to change the age-old system of a “waiting game,” so far as Continental Europe is concerned. Or perhaps it is just as true to say that *because* of the pressing problems on other markets Continental affairs cannot be given the concentrated attention which they deserve.

What the British policy lacks in clarity as regards the old world, that of Russia makes up for. Her immediate policy is based entirely on the needs of her economic development. Of course, as she admits herself and as has been said before, her ultimate goal is the break-down of the capitalistic system throughout the world by means of a tremendous overproduction with which to undermine and to seriously disturb the world market. But the realization of this aim is probably a long way off. In the meantime, her economic development forecasts her policies. Neither tradition, nor consideration, nor friendship, nor enmities, stand in her way. She wants to make the Five-Year Plan a success, if not in five, then in ten years; if not with the cooperation of foreign countries, then in opposition to them. Therefore, the Russian foreign policy will be directed against those who try to delay or destroy her industrial development. If it is Germany (which is improbable) she might line up with France and her Balkan friends. If it is France (which is possible) she might feel inclined to join the German armies and the Italian legions—if they are available.

Russia is the one country that follows most consistently and most radically the laws of economics in her foreign policy. She is, next to France, the one that prepares most extensively for the possibility of “foreign intervention” in a warlike way.

Thus it is seen that there are three political groups forming in Europe: France in the West, with a number of political “partners” in the East lending strength to her predominance on the Continent; a Central-European bloc, with Germany, Austria, Hungary and Italy paralleling the pre-War “Dreibund”; and Russia in the East, standing on her own radical platform of industrial nationalism, with Great Britain at present the outsider. In the third and last instalment, I will deal with the international aspect of the current European situation, and the stand toward it taken by the United States.

EPITAPH FOR AN ACTOR

I who have lived more lives than one
More than one life would die.
Grave on my tomb this epitaph;
Study it, passer-by:

“Here lie the ashes of Claudius,
Cymbeline, John, old Lear;
This is the jealous Mark Anthony;
Romeo languishes here.”

I who have lived with tragedy's
Paint on my leering face,
Hide now behind that lurid mask,
Saved from my own disgrace.

Blame me for all Othello sinned;
Taunt me as cruel Macbeth.
Mark me for these who died in blood,
But leave my own life to death.

J. R. N. MAXWELL, S.J.

Education

Education for Marriage

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

A GOOD many years ago, when "sex education" was beginning to vex and perplex us, I heard Dr. Maurice Bigelow, of Columbia University, say that whatever this education might bring in or leave out, very few teachers were competent to deal with it. Our teachers may have grown in adeptness since that time, but sometimes I doubt it. Case books, printed reports, and speeches at conventions are one thing, and actual advantageous results to the child quite another. Strive as I will I cannot get away from the impression, which has grown with the years, that while some degree of teaching is necessary, the best place to give it is in the home.

The fundamental error in all this sex instruction, outside the Catholic schools, lies in its assumption that acquaintance with certain physiological facts is a safeguard against moral evil. Knowledge is thus a kind of vaccination, or a serum which provides immunity. Very much of that teaching may be described, in the words of Pius XI, as an "exaggerated physiological education . . . by which is learned the art of sinning in a subtle way rather than the virtue of living chastely." The point of view and the whole treatment are purely naturalistic—certain things are to be avoided because they injure health and slow up social progress. Or, as Pius XI observed in the Encyclical on the Education of Christian Youth:

Far too common is the error of those who with dangerous assurance and under an ugly term propagate a so-called sex education, falsely imagining that they can forearm youths against the dangers of sensuality by means purely natural, such as a foolhardy initiation and precautionary instruction for all indiscriminately, even in public. . . . Such persons err grievously in refusing to recognize the inborn weakness of human nature, and the law of which the Apostle speaks, fighting against the law of the mind; and also in ignoring the experience of facts, from which it is clear that, particularly in young people, evil practices are the effect not so much of ignorance of intellect as of weakness of a will exposed to dangerous occasions, and unsupported by means of grace.

Sex instruction of this kind has never had any place in our schools. Catholics have felt instinctively that, whenever necessary, it should be given by "those who hold from God the commission to teach" (Encyclical on Education), and with every precaution taken to strengthen the will as well as to inform the mind. Precisely how authors of texts on this subject, or teachers who use them, avoid arousing unwholesome curiosity, is not easy to understand, since all change the subject just as juvenile curiosity has reached its highest point. The text halts; so, too, presumably, the teacher; but does the child?

The best teacher, undoubtedly, is an intelligent, religious-minded father or mother; and next to them, an understanding teacher. Both Encyclicals assume that instruction, as far as it may be necessary, should be given by parents. Doubtless, the school may supplement them; but when parents are negligent, as many unfortunately are, a question as delicate as it is difficult, arises. The teacher can be greatly helped by such texts as those by

Père Gillet, translated by Dr. Ross, and the more recent volume by Dr. Kirsch, O.M.Cap. Ultimately, however, the extent to which this instruction may go, if, indeed, it is to be given at all, must be left to the decision of the school authorities. Certainly, it would be rash, to say the least, for any teacher to undertake this most difficult task on his or her own motion.

The Catholic tradition finds full play in our schools. It holds that the best sex instruction lays the primary emphasis upon the acquisition of virtue from a supernatural motive. In this scheme, the Sacraments are more important than sex hygiene, and lessons on prayer of higher value than lessons in physiology. Love of righteousness comes before hatred of evil, while motives based upon fear of disease, or other physical results, are of minor importance. But this does not imply neglect of natural means, since the Catholic teacher knows that grace builds upon nature. Hence, an effort is made to strengthen weak points in character, and to develop those that are strong. Just as a field must be cleared of weeds before it can be sown with good seed, so the child is taught that unlovely habits must be uprooted to make way for habits that are good.

Self-repression, the Catholic holds, is quite as necessary as self-expression. If all in us were good (in other words, were actual sin a figment and original sin a myth—a contention which a careful study of any moderately good child will quickly dispel) education would be nothing but the expression of a lovely and lovable self, and the lot of every teacher would be cast in a garden of little angels. But humanity has not yet reached that perfection, and until it has been attained, the don'ts must have their place in education, not always for their own sake, but for the sake of the do's.

Briefly, then, the Catholic teacher in the elementary and secondary school puts small stress on anatomy and physiology. She knows that it is worse than absurd to discourse on venereal disease. Her plan is to perfect natural character as far as possible, to give chastity its proper place among the virtues, and to train the child to seek God's help through regular prayer, and the frequent reception of the Sacraments.

But what of the instruction which, according to the Encyclical, those whose vocation is to marry should receive? I may speak as one foolish, but it seems to me that here our high schools and colleges may be somewhat at fault.

The first part of the instruction demanded by the Encyclical has been begun in the elementary school. But has it been continued? Are we teaching religion, and the duties which it entails, as well as we should? Our colleges are harried and hounded—and occasionally helped—by standardizing agencies and examining boards of all sorts. As a result, has religion become the college Cinderella?

Are we relegating formal religious instruction to a stray half hour here and there, not occupied by subjects of higher importance, such as biology or civics?

The Code of Canon Law clearly enjoins a carefully planned system of religious instruction, beginning with

the elementary school. In the purpose of the Code, if religion is important in the school, it is no less important in the college. If a good teacher is required in the first grade, a teacher at least equally good is required in the senior year at college.

Are we putting that instruction into the hands of some grave Father, bowed down by years, merits, rheumatism, and partial deafness? Are the future mistresses of Catholic homes sitting at the feet of some venerable Mother received into the Community by the Foundress herself, in the year 1868?

If that is the manner in which we are teaching religion, it can hardly be said that our young men and women are given the instruction ordered by the Encyclical on Christian marriage. A Catholic college with a Department of English, but no Department of Religion, is an anomaly. For no other reason do we found colleges save to fit young men and women for citizenship in this world, and for citizenship in the Kingdom of God. That a professor of religion should be on a lower level than the professor of Greek, or his department, if organized at all, be of secondary importance, is unthinkable in the Catholic philosophy of education.

Again, I have been asking myself whether our high schools and colleges could not do more to help young people to avoid those material difficulties, which, the Pontiff observes, occasion many sad disorders. "Care should be taken," he writes, "that the parties themselves, for a considerable time before entering upon the married state, should strive to dispose of, or at least to diminish, the material obstacles in their way."

The phrase "a considerable time" suggests that some aid should be given in the high school and college.

Since ninety per cent of our girls will marry, it would seem reasonable that their education should take cognizance of this fact. Real—as opposed to fraudulent—courses in domestic economy are receiving consideration in our schools and colleges. They should receive more. A girl who has been taught how to cook, sew, care for a house, and make the necessary household purchases scientifically and economically, can do her work as wife much better and more cheaply than the fluff-headed flapper who prepares her husband's dinner with a can opener, and thinks that wise purchasing means buying goods on credit at the nearest shop. One occasion of late marriage is the cost of maintaining a home. One of the best ways of inducing early marriage, and of guaranteeing happy marriage, lies in teaching a girl how to make a house so comfortable, and meals so inviting, that her future husband will find all his earthly happiness with her, even though they live in a hut in the slums.

As for Reginald, he too needs teaching; the good Lord knows he does. Both he and Ethelberta, if they go to college, should be taught the nature and duties of marriage by the professor of ethics as well as by the professor of religion. In addition, why cannot our up-and-coming, and arrived, colleges induce a few happily married grey beards—there are lots of them, in spite of the cynics—to give a talk to the youngsters now and then, on how it is done? He will be sure to tell them how wise

the Pope is in saying that if the husband is the head of the house, the wife is its heart; and he will repeat with an eloquence that comes from experience, how right St. Paul was when he taught that the love of a man for his wife is even as the love of Christ for the Church—all-embracing, sacrificing.

Perhaps, too, he will repeat what I have heard said by more than one man eminent in his profession. "I always talk things over with my wife, and I've never gone wrong when I followed her advice." Happy Reginald! He has a happy Ethelberta for his help mate, one whose value is above rubies.

Sociology

A Misunderstood Institution

EUGENE J. CRAWFORD

REFERENCE is made to that institution commonly known as the House of the Good Shepherd. In stating that it is misunderstood, we prescind from the great misunderstanding occasionally voiced by the professional bigot or deluded zealot. The bald fact is that most Catholics seem to have a distorted and vague knowledge of the purpose, work, and results of the House of the Good Shepherd.

The task of salvaging shipwrecked womanhood goes on so quietly and obscurely that most of our people never give the institution a thought, until the ravings of some biased scandalmonger, or a spectacular attempt by an inmate to free herself from the gently restraining bonds of discipline, graces the pages of our tabloids. Then the jaundiced fanatic brings out the time-worn calumny, and rebrunishes it for the delectation of the morbid, while the average Catholic gives vent to a feeling of sympathy and pity for the Sisters who must pass their lives amid the bedlam of vicious and degenerate women.

These Catholic people are wrong. The woman who plunges to the depths of callous and brutal evil very rarely is incarcerated in a House of the Good Shepherd. Such ladies are usually clever enough to evade the slow-footed (and at times slow-witted) processes of law. The inmates are for the most part sentenced by judicial process, it is true, but if the Recording Angel were to strike an average of evil, he would doubtless award the palm to the large group of feminine sinners who never adorn the House of the Good Shepherd with their presence.

Some of the "children" (so called up to ninety years of age) have never lost their baptismal innocence. Such are the "moral orphans" snatched by vigilant welfare societies from home surroundings where conditions are impossible (e.g. where there is danger of incest) and placed by a kindly magistrate under the care of the Sisters. These inmates sometimes remain for the rest of their lives. A large proportion of the "children" is made up of girls from twelve to eighteen who imitate their brothers by refraining from attendance at school, or who run about town in the evenings with the local youngbloods. Youthful foolishness and stubbornness are the causes of their sojourn, rather than wickedness.

Another group, from about eighteen to senility, constitutes the major portion. Here the seductive allurements of the flesh numbers its victims, but frequently the brand has been snatched from the burning before much harm was done. Commonly, a slightly sub-normal mental equipment or a powerful vanity, makes the girl an easy victim for designing men. Even in these cases there is almost a total lack of viciousness or depravity. Human nature aided by grace quickly rises from one or two falls. In this section of the House are to be found also women of mature age who have voluntarily sought refuge from habits of drink. Sinking beneath the trials of life, they attempt a Pyrrhic victory with the resulting breakdown of their homes and fortunes. Here is weakness to be pitied rather than evil to be castigated.

When the time of commitment is completed many of the girls return to their homes, but a surprisingly large number do not. For some, the House is the first real home they ever knew, and the very thought of returning to their former surroundings is repulsive. These accept a simple rule of life, and live lives which are frequently of extraordinary holiness. They are a powerful means of good for the newcomers, among whom they pass their daily lives. If at times a religious vocation comes to light among them, the happy "Consecrate" becomes a postulant in one of the most unique religious communities in the Church, the Sisters who are commonly known as Magdalenes. The Magdalenes constitute a complete body of religious women, under the supervision of the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. They are an austere contemplative group, and follow the Rule of the Third Order of Mount Carmel. Prayer, penance, and manual labor, are their principal occupations. Sometimes they rise to the heights of sanctity. Catholics in general have a vague knowledge about them, and usually think that they are women who were formerly disgraced by the depths of feminine iniquity. The fact is that some have never sinned grievously, being "moral orphans" spoken of above. Again many have sinned to a less degree than not a few ladies of the world.

The Sisters of the Good Shepherd are a cloistered community, and in addition to the three vows customary to all religious congregations, they take a fourth vow to dedicate their lives to the service of fallen women. These Sisters are the essential factor in the hive of medical, educational, industrial, and spiritual activities which constitute the average House of the Good Shepherd. The spiritual, of course, takes the first place in the attempt at reclamation, but the educational enters largely, too. The girls are assigned to grades, and their elementary training is finished, if necessary. Stenography and typewriting courses are given to some, a classical high-school training to others, and domestic science taught to those who show an aptitude for it. The more mature "children" are assigned to industrial work.

The chaplain labors in a fruitful field. Some who come to the House are totally ignorant of the Faith. Some must be baptized, some prepared for the Sacraments of Penance, Holy Eucharist and Confirmation, some disposed for the reception of the Sacraments after years of ne-

glect. The life of the House centers about the daily Sacrifice of the Mass. Practically every person (frequently to the number of five or six hundred) receives Holy Communion daily. As a result, grace performs its wonders. The purity and sinlessness of the lives of the inmates in the average House of the Good Shepherd surpass those of any average group picked at random from our parishes.

A discouraging feature of the work are the recidivists. The girls are very good when sheltered, but when they return to their former environment they sometimes fall into old habits. The indeterminate sentence, so often questioned, would appear to have more beneficial aspects than otherwise. It is a power placed in the hands of authority which can easily be abused, but where the proper safeguards are present, it is a stimulus to good conduct and real reformation. Under it a girl need not be dismissed until the Sisters are certain that strong habits of good living have been built up.

When a "child" has completed her time satisfactorily she is usually placed under parole. She must report frequently to the Sisters, and to a woman trained in social science who often visits her home. This field of activity is worthy of the interests of the Big Sister organizations.

Judges today are hesitant about placing girls in institutions of reform. They sometimes suspend the sentence, and place them on parole. It is doubtful if such procedure is efficacious; its essential weakness is that it does not remove the girl from the vicious environment of deplorable home conditions or evil companions. Other judges favor the placing of girls in private homes, where they can be constantly supervised, and at the same time receive the benefit of good surroundings, without being stigmatized as inmates of an institution of reform. Theoretically, such a process is ideal, but in fact, it is difficult to discover suitable homes for the girls. Non-Catholic judges, no matter how well-meaning and anxious to help, are as a rule totally ignorant of the sacramental system of grace, which is the secret of the results accomplished by the Sisters of the Good Shepherd. Where can a home be found for a girl which would give her the opportunity to assist at Mass daily, and to receive daily into her heart the Friend of sinners?

This glorious work of reclamation is a unique possession of the Catholic Church. As usual, it must depend largely upon the charity of the Faithful. The fees received from the State (and in only a few States are any fees received) do not cover expenses. Catholics of means could do worse than to assist these noble women who dedicate their lives to distasteful tasks. Moreover a more vigorous defense of the Sisters would be in order, when the slimy hand of bigotry is pointed at them. Last but not least, it is good for us to remember "*Caritas benigna est*," and instead of continually reminding girls who were once "children" in a House of the Good Shepherd of the fact of their incarceration, we should lend them a helping hand. The recidivists not seldom attribute their re-entrance to the over-frequent reminders they receive that they were once in a house of reformation. "Let him who is without sin cast the first stone."

With Scrip and Staff

CHRIST on a coin! This is the question put to the modern world—not in words, but in the making of the actual article—by the new Papal State of the Vatican City. Can, should money, that most dangerous of all creatures, that “root of all evil,” be consecrated to Christ?

Last October there took place in Rome an exhibit prepared by the Catholic business men of Italy. It consisted of their contributions, in the form of manufactured articles, for the foreign missions. Some 30,000 industries or business concerns helped to create it; and it was made up of what each concern could itself produce. The Italian Government gave half-rate freight and charged only one-third fares for visitors to the exposition. The Holy Father himself was present at the exhibit; and viewed the great hall filled to overflowing with objects of every conceivable kind. Each Province of Italy contributed its characteristic product. “Piedmont was represented by yarns, cloth materials, hats and books; Liguria by products of the oil and sugar industry; Venice by devotional objects, its famous candles, and woolen fabrics; Tuscany gave altars, statues, lamps, and vestments; wealthy Lombardy materials, bicycles, and medicines. There was everything from canned goods to typewriters and an automobile. The actual cash, contributed by the banks as their share, was turned into kitchen implements, chests, cookstoves, bicycles, ploughs, etc. There were simply mountains of medical supplies for the medical missions” (*Katholische Missionen*, January, 1931).

Apart from the actual practical utility of the gifts; apart from the generous spirit in which they were given, there was the novel and highly modern feature of the direct consecration of business and industry to the service of Christ Our Lord.

A CERTAIN class of critics complain that the Church stands aloof from modern life; that she tries to divert their minds from present-day, temporal activities. The modernized church, they claim, will be as much at home in the factory as in the sanctuary. Money will be looked upon not as an intrinsic evil, but as the material for stewardship in God's vineyard. Religion will be socially constructive; not inhibitory.

Yet, when the Church does step fairly and squarely into the modern world, and show how the lathe and the dynamo can find their place in the Kingdom of Christ, the critics seem disconcerted. It is a new point of view for them, and like all new things, takes time for adjustment into certain conventional thought-patterns. It seems difficult for them to understand that the Church does not need to be “modernized” to do these things—except in the instruments that she uses. She transcends all time, and is as much at home in the twentieth century as in the first or the tenth.

So our good contemporary, the *Christian Advocate*, remarks:

The use of the effigy of Christ on the chief piece will seem natural enough to the faithful, however out of place it may seem to Protestant Americans who are more familiar with buffaloes, eagles, Indians, Goddesses of Liberty, and Lincolns—not to men-

tion the reverse side of the American dime, which is a sure-enough Fascist emblem. The *Nation*, New York, handles this new gold-piece with a mild sarcasm which we venture to make our own:

“The silver coins are to be imprinted with the images of the Virgin, Saint Michael, Saint Peter, Saint Paul, and the Pope himself. The gold coins are to be even more impressive. They are to have, in addition to a bust of the Pope, the figure of Christ holding a scepter and a globe. A handsome coin, by all accounts. But somehow it reminds us of the money-changers who were driven out of the temple. Evidently that particular quarrel has been patched up.”

Apparently, however, the *Christian Advocate* has not taken too seriously as its own the *Nation's* gibe against a bit of symbolism which would indicate just what the *Christian Advocate* itself would maintain—that money should not be the divinity ruling the world. For it also observes, in another column on the same page: “The *American Mercury* of Mr. Mencken and the *Nation* of Mr. Villard—would any sober American accept them as fairly representative of the mind of America?”

SIMILAR disconcertments among the critics seem to have taken place at the appearance of the Pope's recent Encyclical on Marriage. The trouble is not that the Pope, or the Church, is too ancient, but that the Church is too modern, that she is dealing directly with those provinces of human conduct which men had taken for granted were relegated to the Sunday supplement, to the romantic or psychological novel, or to the professional social theorist. Says the *New Republic*: “It is soberly written, firmly constructed, rich in quotations from the Church Fathers; but it is also voluminous, heavy, and dull.” This dissatisfaction with the Encyclical on its lack of entertainment features is interesting to any explorer of, let us say, Karl Marx, or Westermarck, or the ponderous lucubrations of the eugenists. And a certain degree of volume might be pardoned to a writer who deals in one scope not only with marriage, but with most of the kindred questions of the times as well. The disturbing thing, however, is the modernity of the Church's insight. Thus, for instance, the *Unitarian Christian Register*:

His Holiness is well informed about the present changes in conduct about marriage, and about all matters of sex relationship. In this respect he is a modern of the moderns; but when he sets his cure against the condition in society, the ancient unchanging dogma of the Church, there is a strange incongruity. His voice is of another world. It all seems such a contrast. With intelligent familiarity he discusses birth control, companionate marriage, divorce, but there is no least respect for what the leading minds of the last generation have told us, out of the experience of men and women and the investigating scholarship in scientific, philosophical, and religious fields. Scholars of untainted integrity and creative intelligence are disregarded.

One obvious thing seems to escape the Pope's commentators: that the Church is not only well informed about all developments in the field of marriage and the family, but that she is infinitely more informed about the actually factual elements in such developments than the vast majority of her critics. The dogmatic teachings of the Church are not laid down in the abstract, least of all in matters pertaining to human conduct. They are applied in the light of the well-nigh infinite experience of her pastors

of souls in every country of the world, in every age, with every race and condition of mankind.

OBVIOUS, too, is the fact that the evils against which the Pope's voice is raised, are by no means necessarily modern. Divorce, companionate unions, licentious writings and stage productions, are far older than Christianity. The philosophy of complete individualism, which is the postulate of birth control, and usurps for itself the fair names of "romantic love," "the rights of personality," and so on, is as old as the Egyptian tombs; the State absolutism which would impose sterilization for other than crime, derives from an absolutism older than Babylon. What the Pope stigmatizes is not a progress. It is a retrogression.

The chief perplexity, I think, in those who try to find some way to characterize the Encyclical, is caused by the typical assumption that all these things must be good, and wise, and highly beneficent, not because they have been proved to be so, but simply because a rather large number of people are doing them and approving of them. The fact that numbers of people have done them and approved of them in the past without ever getting anywhere, except to die out, does not seem to occur.

The particular beauty of this argument is that it can be applied in any direction you desire. You can justify bootleggers and gangsters; political corruptionists; lynch law; child labor; defrauding laborers of their wages, in the same way. It is the essential argument for social Toryism; the death of genuine Liberalism. Were it to be accepted as valid, there could be no work of reform, no protests against abuses, as long as these have the color of a majority practice.

PERPLEXITY has also come to these critics from the Pope's insistence on the creative and social view of marriage, instead of the purely individualistic and emotional concept. Certainly nothing is more characteristic of the more constructive phases of modern thought than its insistence that the individual cannot consider himself merely as an individual, but must express in his own life the fulness of his relationships to society. Yet the *Christian Register*, for instance, is amazed to find that "the primary end of marriage is the procreating and the education of children"; and the *New Republic* is horrified at the Pope's opposition to birth control.

Said the *New York Times* in its soberly-worded editorial on January 10:

To some social reformers the Encyclical may seem depressing in its denial that their efforts are rightly directed. But the Catholic Church does not address itself to one age or one century. It endeavors to look at the world and the unfolding of civilization *sub specie aeternitatis*. And even enthusiasts must admit the possibility that in a hundred years or more their theories will have been proved inadequate, so that then more plausibility and force may be seen in the view expressed today by the Holy See of Rome.

The need of a marriage philosophy in accordance with the social requirements of the age may bring healthful doubt to those who now so cheerfully pin their hearts to any ancient, refurbished theory that happens for the moment to make good "copy."

THE PILGRIM.

Dramatics

Current Plays and Players

ELIZABETH JORDAN.

WHEN the Theater Guild does anything it does it thoroughly. Of its second production this season, "Elizabeth the Queen," it made a success which will be part of the history of American drama. Of its third production "Midnight," billed by the Guild as a "melodrama" and written by Claire and Paul Sifton, it made an equally complete failure.

With every desire to be kind to the Guild group after the delight they gave us with "Elizabeth" I find it impossible to say one good word for "Midnight." As a play it is at all times chaotic, confused and at moments idiotic. In addition to this the acting is uninspired, the diction of the members of the cast as a whole is the worst on our stage this winter, and—incredible fact—even the direction by the able Philip Moeller is bad!

At the end of the first act on the opening night I was wondering if something disastrous had happened to my own mental machinery, when I heard all around me the confused queries of other puzzled spectators. Then one of the cleverest men in New York crossed the aisle and sat down beside me.

"What's this play about?" he asked dazedly. "I simply can't make head or tail of it!"

No one could. Everyone around us was asking me the same question. One reason why none of us knew what the play was about was that none of the spectators back of the fifth or sixth row could hear a word of it. A superb mumbling and word-swallowing contest was in progress on the stage, with Glenn Anders easily carrying off the dishonors. Then Mr. Moeller, regardless of the fact that the members of his company were speaking some unintelligible jargon of their own, had the bright idea of seating them all at a table in an alcove up stage. Or possibly he was thinking of the spectators and decided not to annoy them by any sounds at all. In either case, there was the first-night audience, hearing almost nothing and unable to understand what it did hear. The majority of faces in that audience took on the expression which by this time must be so familiar to the Guild directors. It says in effect, "Oh, well, we're in for another failure. Let's make the best of it." And the spectators turn their thoughts inward or reflect on the vagaries of the present stock market.

At the end of the second act they had a chance for a good laugh, and they made the most of it. The heroine of the play, pretty little Linda Watkins, came in with a pistol in her hand, uttered a yowl, and slumped into her chair to register the fact that she had just killed a man. Rarely has there been a pleasanter moment in the Guild Theater than the one that followed. The audience gave itself up to delighted chortles. As the curtain fell immediately we had an intermission in which stranger smiled at stranger and exchanged ask-me-anothers about the play. Everybody was in good spirits except the woman behind me, who throughout the evening moaned at intervals "Oh,

how *stupid* this is," and who kept right on moaning even during that refreshing interval. The hilarious reception of the poignant scene was not, of course, Miss Watkins' fault. No actress could have put it over. It was just one of those things of which we'll tell our grandchildren some winter night in 1960 when the lights and the talk are low.

As to the climax of the play, nothing more idiotic has been offered to a New York audience, if I interpret rightly the confused mumble from the stage. A New York District Attorney is assured by a smug reporter (Glenn Anders) that he, the District Attorney, would better let a young murderess go scot free, because he could not possibly convict her and because he would lose his office and his political standing if he did not convict her! The authors of "Midnight" are newspaper people. If there were no other newspaper people and no readers of newspapers in their audiences they might get away with this amazing statement. As there are, "it is to laugh." But the murder and this climax do not really provide enough good laughs for a full evening's entertainment, so "Midnight" will have to go to the store house as soon as the rest of the subscribers have seen it, or have escaped seeing it.

In last month's dramatic review I predicted that the Guild Board would not be foolish enough to carry out its plans to interrupt the run of "Elizabeth" with a revival of "Much Ado About Nothing." But it was foolish enough to attempt to do so. It even sent out seats for the opening night of the revival. After that it had a second sober thought and sent out notices asking subscribers to destroy those seats! It must be a great life in the Guild offices, if one doesn't weaken.

And now for a glance at Helen Hayes in "Petticoat Influence," a comedy written by Neil Grant and presented by Gilbert Miller at the Empire Theater.

Miss Hayes is one of the little band of actresses who are loudly announcing that they do not want their acting or their plays reviewed by dramatic critics because dramatic critics really know nothing about actresses or acting. Miss Hayes is a charming actress who has had unusual success at a very early age, and she owes a great deal of this success to the critics she is reviling. What she needs to do now is to confine her spoken lines to those written for her by intelligent playwrights. She should not try to express her own thoughts, which appear to be chaotic. Critics being only human, most of them have fallen rather heavily on the work Miss Hayes is doing in her new play. Personally, I think the actress and her work in the new play are both charming and that the play itself is a sparkling and amusing trifle which is well worth an evening of one's time. If Miss Hayes will lend herself exclusively to study and meditation in her off hours all will be forgiven and all should be well.

It may be the untimely death of the playwright, William Bolitho, and its occurrence during the rehearsals of his play, which stirred the critics to so much emotion over "Overture," presented by Bela Blau at the Longacre Theater. Critics are more human than they are supposed to be, and there is something especially poignant in the

death of a creator during the progress of his creation. One wants to live to finish one's job, and Mr. Bolitho was a propagandist who took his work very seriously. In "Overture" he wrote a play with one big act and with a lot of good work throughout. It is so good that if he had lived he could doubtless have made it better and improved it into a real success. He would have quickened the action, cut out a lot of the almost endless talk, made his principal character a trifle more consistent and convincing. As it is, "Overture" is an impressive but uneven play, which its friends are doing their best to build into the success its central idea and its one big act deserve.

"The First Night," written by Frederick Ruth and presented at the Eltinge Theater by Richard Herndon, is another of those plays which are balancing delicately between success and failure. It is interesting, not especially convincing (but how few plays are!) and it has an excellent cast which performs as much in the audience as on the stage. Its scene is the stage of Sing Sing Prison where a play is being given before the convicts, with the Warden and the Governor of New York in the audience. It is all quite unusual and exciting and I, for one, hope it will continue.

Mr. Lee Shubert has been playing in the daisied fields and filling his little hands with flowers. In the past his musical attractions, while always superbly produced, have not always followed the high standards of taste and morality. This season he has put on at the Shubert Theater a new musical comedy entitled "Meet My Sister," to which all the young folks home from school and college are being taken by their relieved parents. New fallen snow has nothing on this comedy in whiteness, save only in the matter of a few lines which could be excised and never missed; and the work of the young singing comedian, Walter Slezak, is little short of perfect. The story is appealing, the music delightful, and the acting excellent. Mr. Shubert ought to have a "Kindergarten Day" and let all the little tots in free—a recommendation I *never* expected to make of one of his musical shows!

The same tribute to its flower-like purity can *not* be offered to "Three's a Crowd," put on by Max Gordon at the Selwyn Theater and starring Clifton Webb, Fred Allen and Libby Holman. Webb is graceful, Allen is funny and Libby Holman sings her famous song "Body and Soul." That is the best I can do for "Three's a Crowd," except to add that it is an established popular success.

REVIEWS

Leigh Hunt and His Circle. By EDMUND BLUNDEN. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$4.00.

The Friend of Shelley: a Memoir of Edward John Trelawney By H. J. MASSINGHAM. New York: D. Appleton and Company. \$3.50.

Mr. Blunden is to be congratulated on his matured and finished work, which is stamped with the mark of a poet, a critic, and a sane scholar. He eschews sensational heightening, and seldom thrusts his own personality forward. Yet when he does so it is with such wry wit and critical grace, that the reader is gratified to hear him. Hunt numbered among his friends almost every prominent literary figure in England from Lamb to the Brownings.

His idealistic nature and unrestrained devotion "to the cause of Liberty," which carried him to prison, drew around him, at the same time, the warm hearts of many sympathizers. His genius for friendship is the salient feature of Hunt's life as developed by Mr. Blunden. From the days at Christ's Hospital when Hunt scribbled his essays, elbow to elbow with Coleridge and Lamb, beneath the hawk-eye and heavy-handed James Boyer who "hurled forth the lightnings" until almost the day of his death, when we find him defending John Keats' poetry against the attacks of Cardinal Wiseman, the resolute loyalty and honor of the man are strikingly evident. Mr. Blunden spent ten years collecting and arranging the material for this book. Anyone interested in the period of the Regency is in his debt. Mr. Massingham is less happy in his subject, and is handicapped by paucity of material. No life of Trelawney has heretofore been written. His papers were burned at his death, and his literary output was slender. The diligent labor of the biographer has unearthed new material for his labor of love. Trelawney is a chimerical figure. "The biographers of Shelley bless him; of Byron, curse him." General opinion has marked him a charlatan and a parasite, partaking of the faults of the Romantic group but not of their virtues. Although Mr. Massingham would have us re-estimate the man, the evidence available affords little ground to do so. He was undisciplined both in his affections and literary endeavors. The author sums up the opinion we hold of him in his final sentence: "We therefore can look back with wonder at this passionate, free and instinctive being, and likewise regret that, throwing off the bonds of external servitude, he could not learn how to govern himself." T. A. S.

Voltaire. By GEORG BRANDES. Two Volumes. New York: Albert and Charles Boni. \$10.00.

Again departing from his chosen field of literary criticism, where he is an authority, Georg Brandes presents us with a new biography of Voltaire and a racy picture of the eighteenth century. Mr. Brandes leaves the reader in little doubt as to his estimate of Voltaire: "A very small number, at most a few dozen, are important in world history. Voltaire is one of these." How Brandes reaches this conclusion, which strikingly forms the first paragraph, will more than puzzle the reader. A more sane estimate would value him thus: a poet of the second order, who has more cleverness than inspiration; a delicate romancer, who lacks imagination and heart; a critic, in whom taste is not at fault, but whose views are too narrow; a polemist of the first order but who has only a smattering of knowledge and no conscience at all; a prodigious essayist, judged by his work on every subject, their variety and number, but in which one searches in vain for strong emotion, profound conviction, the broad and potent idea which makes great men—men of genius. In his repulsively sensual picture of the eighteenth century Brandes unconsciously gives the clue to Voltaire's apparent greatness. Only in an age of moral corruption, could such writings as his pass muster, only in an age of spiritual stagnation would he find himself the darling of the salon, the petty god of literary thought. Imagine, if you can, Voltaire in the thirteenth century! A fowl may strut in the barnyard, but he would cut a comical figure on Fifth Avenue. Georg Brandes is the author of "Jesus a Myth." J. H. G.

The Dutch and Swedes on the Delaware. By CHRISTOPHER WARD. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. \$5.00.

This book tells the story of the early settlements along the shores of the bay, and on the banks of the river, Delaware. To Henry Hudson is accredited the discovery, in 1609, of Delaware Bay and on this discovery is based the claim of the Dutch of New Amsterdam to all the Delaware territory. By 1638 the Swedes penetrated this region and from that date the river was ruled by Swedes and Dutch. "At times they divided its ownership between them; at times they alternated in complete domination. Their affairs were thus so intertwined that their stories must be told as one." In 1664 the English took not only the Delaware settlement, but New Amsterdam as well, and Swedish and Dutch both faded from the picture. New Amsterdam then became New York, but by the Treaty of Westminster, February 19, 1674, this town of many

names, Manhattan, was restored to Holland and bore the name New Orange, only a brief time later to be restored and renamed New York, and as an appanage of this main colony the Delaware river territory, too, became English once again. Johan Printz, the four-hundred-pound Governor of New Sweden, is a noteworthy character. The struggles and troubles of Printz and his compatriots are humorously related. Certain incidents and details are told with a good grace that compares favorably with Washington Irving's "Father Knickerbocker," though there is not the sustained humor of that incomparable artist's talent. In this book, Mr. Ward has made a real contribution to historic literature. He has cleared up much that was confused, or even unknown, in the history of the Dutch and Swedes on the Delaware. M. J. S.

The Life of Mahomet. By EMILE DERMENGHEM. New York: The Dial Press. \$5.00.

This book is not only an account of Mahomet's life; it also attempts to be somewhat of a "rehabilitation" of him and his doctrines. From a merely biographical standpoint, the author has little to offer that is not already known about Mahomet. Mr. Dermenghem feels that the historians, especially the Christians, have dealt unfairly with the "prophet" of Allah. In attempting to give Mahomet his due, the author proceeds by speaking of the visions and revelations experienced by Mahomet as if they were really authentic and supernatural, and by attempting to show that Mahometanism and Christianity were practically the same religion until, through misunderstandings, an impassable gulf grew between them. The author feels that it is erroneous to believe that Mahomet was an epileptic. How, he asks, could an epileptic be the great organizer and teacher that Mahomet was? Be that as it may, the "trances" of Mahomet bear no resemblance to the ecstatic states of the true mystic. Mr. Dermenghem is also at great pains to show the similarity between the teachings of the Koran and Christian dogma. While it is true that there were many similarities, Mahomet's concept of Christ was not the Christian's. And that is the crux of the whole question. To Mahomet, Christ was the servant of God, not His Son (Koran, 4, 169). The author himself admits that Islamism did not "look upon Jesus as a saviour and mediator" (p. 113). That being the case, Islamism and Christianity are two vastly different religions in spite of all insistence upon similarities. The author is apparently not accurately informed upon the teachings of Christianity, and has a tendency to quote from the Koran those passages which seem to bolster up his arguments for similarity of the two religions, while he ignores other passages in which the point at issue is more clearly stated. One cannot help but conclude that sincere though Mahomet may have been, prophet he was not. On his own admission he performed no miracles to prove his claims. The book is well written, although the incidents in the opening chapters are not told in their chronological order and hence are difficult to follow. The translation is the work of Arabella Yorke. There is an index of proper names. W. C. S.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Catholic Action Series.—The call for Catholic action has been the inspiration and the guide for the complete, thorough, and practical series of instructions and tests in religion which the Rev. Raymond J. Campion and Ellamay Horan have arranged for Catholic High School students. In the present series there are four distinct units: "Religion, Book One" (\$1.25); "Religion, Book Two" (\$1.50); "The Mass: A Laboratory Manual" (40 cents); "My Character Book, Part One" (95 cents); "Diagnostic Tests" (80 cents per package of thirty sets). This array will give some suggestion of the completeness and thoroughness of the course. The method of treatment brings the study of religion to its rightful place not only of prime importance but of most lively interest for the high school pupils. The best of modern pedagogical methods have been followed and a venture has been made into the field of diagnostic testing of character as well as knowledge. Keeping the teacher in mind as well as the pupil, the authors seem to have removed the last possible reason for

delay of the introduction of their course in the Catholic High School. The Teachers' Manual for books one and two on Religion is in itself a guide for efficiency and success in the treatment and presentation of any of the subjects in the curriculum as well as a spur to greater energy in conducting a lively and interesting class of religion. For the Diagnostic Tests there are directions to the teacher and key charts to facilitate the correction and scoring of student papers.

Of special interest is the laboratory manual "My Character Book." This seems to fill a long-felt need and answer an oft-repeated criticism, by supplying a place for and giving emphasis to the so-called "natural virtues." Here are given tests and assignments in honesty, truthfulness, trustworthiness, gratitude and other virtues which form the solid foundation of strong character and the true ground for the action of Divine grace. William H. Sadlier, Inc., the publishers of this series, have caught the spirit of the work and cooperated fully with its authors.

History.—The Illinois Historical Society continues to preserve valuable data in the pages of its quarterly *Mid-America*. The contents of the issue for January, 1931, includes these papers: "Catholic Missionary Schools Among the Indians of Minnesota," Hugh Graham; Pioneer Catholics of Nodaway County, Missouri; Damian Leander Cummings; "Father Gabriel de la Ribourde, II," Marion A. Habig; "An Early Missouri River Journal," Nicholas Point. In the "Varia," Anthony Matre continues his interesting records of the national conventions of the once flourishing American Federation of Catholic Societies. They serve the very useful purpose of showing that many of the plans and projects of the supposed sophisticates of the present were thought out and put under process of evolution by the good and zealous workers of the Federation for whom none are so poor as to do them reverence in these high-pressure days.

In the January, 1931, number of the *Catholic Historical Review* are these contributions: "Helmold: Chronicler of the North-Saxon Missions," Francis J. Tschan; "St. Irenaeus and the See of Rome," Michael O'Boyle; "Peter Martyr D'Anghiera: Humanist and Historian," Theodore Maynard; "The Harvard-Catholic University Joint Expedition to Serabit-el-Khedina (Sinai)," Rumanns Butin. There are in addition some fifty pages of book reviews and literary notes.

Privately printed, at Detroit, an elaborate brochure, by Francis F. Van Antwerp and Charles W. Heath, makes a sympathetic memorial of the distinguished career of the late Right Rev. Francis J. Van Antwerp, V.G., P.A. The lamented prelate, during a sacerdotal career of half a century, was a lasting and fruitful influence in the city of his birth and the diocese in whose progress he took no mean part.

Varia.—Time was, and not so very, very long ago, when any respectable person who read "Ouida's" novels was supposed to have lapsed into the chaos of final impenitence. What a relative contrast in comparison to present literary conditions! At all events, in the height of her dubious fame, that once popular novelist dropped her pen-name and, under her proper cognomen, Louise de la Ramée, wrote a paradoxical and appealing story of the love of a dog for his little master, "A Dog of Flanders" (Beckley-Cardy, 60 cents). This absorbing juvenile classic, that has since moved the hearts of children everywhere, is published in most attractive form with twenty-two colored illustrations.

Jessie E. Logan has made a collection of thoughts from the best sources of ancient and modern literature with the title "Goodly Company" (Beckley-Cardy, \$1.00). It is designed as a book of quotations and proverbs for the development of character and will be found most helpful for those whose activities lie in the work of schools or in the care of children. The arrangement of subjects is practical and convenient.

A series, "Read It Yourself Stories" (Beckley-Cardy, 70 cents), by Jessie A. Harris and Lillian M. Edmonds, built around nursery rhymes and original characters, is designed to create a desire to read and to fix proper habits and skill in reading. A vocabulary of 598 different words is used.

Spiritual Readings.—For the approaching season of Lent one can make splendid preparation by a careful reading of "The Divine Romance" (Century, \$1.50), by the Rev. Fulton J. Sheen. In his usual graphic, vital, and earnest presentation, Father Sheen presents the interpretation of the principal beliefs of the Catholic faith. He treats familiar truths of religion with a freshness and vigor that give new meaning and clearer understanding of them. In seven chapters he discusses: Man's Quest for God; the Blessed Trinity; Love's Overflow; God's Quest for Man; the Divine Equation; the Pulpit of the Cross; Dying and Behold We Live. Through all these pages there is the same singleness of purpose, namely, to show in every dealing of God with man the unmeasurable Divine love expressed in unspeakable goodness and mercy. This is a book that will inspire and help the non-Catholic as well as the Catholic. It brings a universal appeal and a message of comfort and encouragement.

"The Catholic Church and Bolshevism" (Herder, \$1.00) is a series of seven lectures by John A. McClorey, S.J. From a discussion of the economic chaos and political revolution, he advances to a study of the cupidity of the poor as well as the cupidity of the rich. The last discourse, on charity, treats in a strikingly new manner of the charity which the rich should show toward the poor and also of the charity which the poor should show toward the rich. This is a division of the virtue of charity which is frequently lost sight of. A careful perusal of Father McClorey's discourses should greatly help to a better understanding and a fuller appreciation of the Church's teachings on these vitally important matters.

The works of Pierre Charles, S.J., have become so well known and so popular that it is hardly necessary to do more than announce the appearance of a third series of "Prayer for All Times" (Kenedy, \$2.00). The reflections in this volume draw practical lessons from the striking passages of the Gospels and Epistles. They are suitable for daily meditation or for short spiritual readings.

The third series of short meditations for priests, which Anthony Huonder, S.J., presents under the general title of "At the Feet of the Divine Master" (Herder, \$2.25), have for their sub-title, "The Morning of Glorification." The meditations in this volume cover the mystery of the Resurrection and the subsequent events up to the descent of the Holy Spirit. Though chiefly intended for priests, these books may be used with profit by others either for meditation or spiritual reading. The present volume is particularly welcome because there has long been a dearth of suitable material for this season of the Ecclesiastical year.

Although "The Evening of Life" (Bruce, \$2.00) is a series of reflections of Msgr. Baunard, translated from the French by John L. Stoddard, on approaching old age, they may be read with great profit by young and old alike. For here is pictured an old age that is in reality the beginning of a better and longer life. There is a vast fund of erudition packed into these chapters, with rapid surveys of periods and quick summaries of shifting doctrines and theories, that give a new insight and a better appreciation of many of the changes that have been effected in the passing years. One discovers here the record of a rich, full life that has discovered the happiness of making life not only a time for service but for praise and reverence as well. The book is heartily recommended for leisurely reading, when one wants to pause and reflect and then resolve.

In the Catholic Library of Religious Knowledge the thirteenth volume is given over to "Mediaeval Spirituality" (Herder, \$1.35) by Felix Vernet and translated by the Benedictines of Talacre. After a comprehensive survey of the various schools and their masters, there is an examination of the different doctrine and methods of prayer. The book contains a good bibliography, but it has no index.

William I. Lonergan, S.J. offers some short readings for Lent in his two very timely pamphlets: "The Story of Lent" and "Devotions in Lent" (America Press, 5 cents each). The former gives a brief history of the penitential season, explains its purpose and summarizes the present Lenten legislation of the Church; the latter explains the liturgy of Lent and suggests some suitable devotions.

The Wind from the West. Slane's Long Shots. Gambler's Throw. Gog and Magog. The Silver Swan.

The "Wind from the West" (Macmillan, \$2.00) which Pamela Hinkson hails in her novel under that title, is the breath of freedom which comes to the two young rebels from French traditions. Marguerite and Solange de Brieuc have lived in the great chateaux inherited together with many traditions from a long line of ancestors. Outwardly they conform, but at heart they become rebels. Eventually an American, Peter Quincey, appears in the rapid succession of pictures and he brings with him a tradition of his own. Peter shows that he can be as unyielding even as Solange's grandmother. He is the hero of the story and dominates with his personality the staid society of old-world France. But at the close of the story it is "still Brittany where one burnt lamps and candles, and lived in the past." The closing scene is a fitting climax for the author's artistry.

Even in the world of fiction these are dangerous days for kings. In the realm of detective and mystery yarns a conflict has been started to elevate E. Phillips Oppenheim from his rank as "Prince of Story-tellers" to that of king. Whether or not Edgar Wallace will ultimately be forced to vacate his throne, Mr. Oppenheim makes good his right to royal honors in the realm by his series of interesting documents from the archives at Scotland Yard recounting "Slane's Long Shots" (Little, Brown, \$2.00). Here are a series of thrilling tales with only the leading action of Sir Jasper Slane to give them unity. He is that familiar figure in London society known as a gentleman detective. Everywhere he turns he finds mysteries that have baffled the C. I. D., and with a confident grace and an enviable ease he settled both problems and fates. The reader shares the variety of Sir Jasper's experiences and thoroughly enjoys the author's cunning insight and resourcefulness.

Eustace L. Adams, in "Gambler's Throw" (Dial, \$2.00) is credited with having carried off the detective story in an aeroplane. For in addition to the ordinary properties of the thriller, this ex-pilot introduces the reader to the flying field and the plane, together with many unusual types of adventure. The story begins with a bit of misfortune for Jerry Calhoun, leads on to a hold-up just when Jerry was already sufficiently thrilled at the sudden turn of events which brought him in the limousine with the popular and, of course, beautiful actress. The actress is kidnapped and Jerry afterwards wakes up in a hospital. Then starts an investigation of a criminal's scheme. Apparently with a scientific turn of mind, the villain planned after kidnapping and imprisoning some prominent individuals on a strange island, to study the psychological reactions and developments. But Jerry Calhoun gives up his monotonous business of supplying thrills for jaded vacationists by introducing them to the air. He goes in search of the hidden lair of the criminal. And just as Ashwood's plans were sprouting their greatest promise, Jerry discovers the hiding place of the criminal. Here is promised mystery that is tense as a drawn wire and adventure as fresh as the air at high altitude. Nor is romance left out of the list of ingredients which go to make up this new thriller. It is filled with rapid action that rattles like the throw of the dice of chance and whirs like the speeding engine of fate. Even the hypercritical fan will find a thrill in this Adams type of mystery.

Vincent Sheean writes a novel of Russia, "Gog and Magog" (Harcourt, Brace, \$2.00) in which he adroitly introduces the arguments for and against the Russian experiment in Soviet government. The story begins with comedy and suddenly turns to a deep moving tragedy. The characters are well drawn, the dialogue is natural, at least for the actors on such a stage. The author, a journalist of experience, shows a knowledge of his backgrounds and of the problems he has selected to discuss. But the Russian situation is not handled by Mr. Sheean as a treatise on economic and social conditions, but as a vehicle for a delightful and stirring romance. There are some fine shafts of satire and many brilliant flashes of comment on America, on art, on all the topics which the sophisticated glibly and superficially discuss at social gatherings. Sheila Rudd, an American girl who has tried the Russian experiment, is the outstanding character of the novel.

Communications

Letters to ensure publication should not, as a rule, exceed 500 words. The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department. No attention will be paid to anonymous communications.

Labor Unions and Craftsmanship

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read "Labor Unions and Craftsmanship," by C. J. Freund, in the issue of AMERICA for January 10.

I hope Mr. Freund's article will bring some good results, but for the first time in all my experience in reading AMERICA I read an article by a man who does not "know his stuff."

For at least sixteen years that I know about, members of the electricians' union in different parts of the country were expected in common honesty to correct their mistakes on their own time. This is a very flexible rule. In most cases it works out to the contractor's advantage. Time and time again the man on the job takes the blame for the contractor's mistakes. If he refuses to lie, when the contractor wants him to, or to take the blame for what the contractor ordered him to do, his check is waiting for him when the job is finished.

Regarding Mr. Freund's boarding-house experience in a town where a boom was on, an explanation is in order. Work on buildings is done in successive operations. Each craft has its place on the job, like street cars on the same track. If one car breaks down the whole track is tied up. So with the job, if one craft is slow the whole job is slow. The man who said, of possible discharge for wood-butchers, "Let them try it, just once!" was just talking. When the carpenters caught up with their work, the shoemakers were politely laid off. They left with a smile on their faces and more money in their pockets than they ever earned before in the same period of time.

The locals agree to furnish men as needed. In times of great demand they take any they can get and expect the older men to carry them along on the job. These elders can teach the young man a few tricks for a certain operation, and in that way let him earn his pay and do his part to keep the job moving.

Mr. Freund writes, as I see it, entirely from the contractor's point of view, and is very far from facts as I know them to be.

For the rest, I know AMERICA and the Catholic Church are the best friends labor has. His article will do some good in some places, but I believe he has created a very bad impression elsewhere. If he will come to Chicago, during this depression, he will learn enough about unions and craftsmanship to write ten articles, showing how the public is protected, how our apprentices are educated, how our night school, our insurance and pension funds, and our emergency relief are administered.

Chicago.

WILLIAM J. SIMS.

"This Racktending Business"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I write briefly of what I count as large factors in the success of our bookrack, at St. Vincent de Paul's Church, Albany?

First, our pastor, the Rev. William R. Charles, has shown the greatest interest in it, has placed it under the patronage of Our Lady of Lourdes, and with his splendid vision, guidance, and suggestions has made the bookrack a great success.

Second, the bookrack is in a conspicuous place in the grotto connected with St. Vincent's Church. This grotto of Our Lady of Lourdes is somewhat unique: Mass is celebrated daily and visitors in great numbers are seen. At novenas and other spiritual exercises, which are frequently held, friends come not only from other parishes, but from neighboring cities as well.

Third, the Sisters of the Order of Mercy, who are the teachers at Vincentian Institute, are familiar with the bookrack and recommend suitable booklets to their pupils.

Fourth, we keep the bookrack seasonal and always have in it booklets on Our Lady of Lourdes.

Finally, literature for non-Catholics is always on hand.

Albany, N. Y.

M. A. D., Vincentian Library Staff.